

# THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva  
by the World's Student Christian Federation

Dr. W. A. VISSER 't HOOFT *Editor*

---

VOLUME XXV

Second Quarter, 1932

NUMBER 2

---

## EDITORIALS

### The Revival of the Church

When a member of the World's Student Christian Federation talks about the Church he is not talking about something outside of himself, something which he can stand over against and criticise. When he speaks of the Church he speaks of himself. For the World's Student Christian Federation is a movement within the Church, and apart from the Church the Federation has no meaning.

Consequently, in speaking of the revival of the Church a member of the Federation implies that he finds himself in a situation where his own life stands in need of revival and where the lives of all those who share with him in that particular fellowship stand in similar need.

What are the conditions for a revival of the Church? There is but one real condition. The Church will be revived as soon as men find in the Church the way of salvation for themselves and for society.

For the moment the vast majority of people who desire a way of salvation are convinced that they will have to find it outside the Church. This applies even to many who continue to maintain some sort of personal relationship with the Church. There is no common agreement among modern men as to what constitutes the way of salvation. Some

identify the way of salvation with realising the destiny of their own sovereign nation-state, others identify it with a particular organisation of industrial society, while others identify it with some special theory of education or with some special programme of moral reform. The Church cannot recover its authority over the minds of men by attempting to compete with any of these alternative methods of deliverance. It will only recover its authority by performing its own unique mission; by demonstrating the reality of its faith through dynamic forms of personal and social life adequate to the spiritual and ethical needs of our day.

It is sometimes assumed that a group of duly elected Church leaders ought to be able to devise a rational plan or invent a rational formula which, if put into operation, would result in the revival of the Church. All attempts to revive the Church by rational formulations are, of course, doomed to failure in advance, no matter how plausible or true the formulations may be. A scheme for Church unity or a formula for Church revival constituted by theoreticians in the interest of an ecclesiastical Utopia may be very gratifying to minds which appreciate order and logic. It would, however, be entirely incapable of producing a revival, and might, in fact, even retard the coming of a revival by fostering premature optimism or by deluding those who had adopted it into imagining that by its adoption the actual concrete situation of the Church had been changed, whereas the probability is that the actual situation after its adoption would be exactly the same as the situation before its adoption. An organisational or intellectual adjustment within the Church is not the kind of signal that will convince mankind that they ought to look once more to see if the path of deliverance lies that way. Too often in history a formula of revival or a scheme of unity has proved to be the draft of an epitaph rather than the signal of a resurrection.

A revival of the Church depends upon the authenticity and reliability of the witness to the Christian faith given by individuals and groups within the Church. There are already indications that in many different parts of the world such a witness is being given with increasing power. As men and



women appear who are convinced that the only way of salvation lies through the Christian Church, and whose conviction expresses itself in a determination to act rather than in an inclination to talk, then the revival of the Church will already have begun.

These men and women will act and think as members of a world-wide Christian community. As they live together and as they work together a dynamic lay movement will spring up within the Church which will include groups from all the various sects, denominations and confessions. This dynamic fellowship will move irresistibly towards the reform of the Church. It will create new forms through which to express its life, and out of these new forms will grow the Church of the future. The Church Universal will some day achieve expression in institutional forms on this earth.

Perhaps the significance of a small movement like the World's Student Christian Federation is to be found just in this: that it can serve as a training ground for this world-wide lay movement out of which will eventually come the revival of the Church. By its teaching and by its experience it may help to produce the men and women who can demonstrate in the world what is meant by the Christian way of deliverance.

F. P. M.

### Students and the Church

The generation is not far behind us which would have considered it a strange phenomenon to see a student movement magazine devote its pages to the discussion of the Church. Today nothing is more natural. This number of *The Student World* is simply the reflection of a vital preoccupation which has recently found expression in many ways in the various national Student Christian Movements. What is it that has caused this change of attitude to the Church?

It is certainly not that students have become less critical of the Church than they were some decades ago. The men who have contributed articles to the first part of this number are certainly representing the best section of student

opinion when they launch their concerted and violent attack upon the faithlessness and cowardice, the wordliness and mediocrity of present Church-life. And the student leaders who in the second part of our number tell the story of the rediscovery of the Church in various ways and at various places are ecclesiastical revolutionaries rather than blind defenders of things as they are.

Nor is it that students have found a Church outside the Church, an invisible Church floating high above the visible Churches, undefiled by the all-too-human characteristics of real life on this planet. The whole significance of the movement Church-ward among students is precisely that it takes its stand in the actual Churches and that it rejects the pharisaical attitude of intellectual spectatorship with its slogan : " The visible Church for the masses ; the invisible Church for me." And the most violent criticisms of the Church in these pages come from men who are identified with it and suffer deeply from the sickness of the body of which they are members.

If Christian students today are increasingly willing to take the Church seriously it is that they begin to rediscover a very simple truth, which belongs to the essence of Christian faith, namely that God does not speak in generalities but in very specific terms. There is a particular place in history where God has revealed Himself : Jesus Christ. There is a particular place in the world where we hear His word spoken to us : the Church. A new awareness has come for God's boundless grace in giving us a place in the midst of this confusing human scene where He speaks and where we can only listen. And just because it is the place of God it must be violently criticised wherever and whenever it becomes the place of some other deity.

It is to the better understanding of this Church as well as to more faithful identification with its life that this number of *The Student World* would call its readers.

V. 't H.



## Questions which "Christianity" must face

KARL BARTH

Which are the questions which Christianity must face today? The first question is: does "Christianity" see and understand that, in contrast to the past, it is faced today by a whole series of other "religions"? A "religion" is not the same thing as a scientific, political, moral or æsthetic philosophy of life. Man can choose his philosophy of life, or even invent one of his own. He can give logical reasons for it but it has little to do with his real existence (his "private life"). It leaves him essentially independent for his real anchor is elsewhere. On the other hand, a "religion" is the apprehension of and assent to a message of a god whom man discovers. A "religion" therefore takes hold of man with a power which overcomes all personal choices and desires and which forces him to obey without knowing, or wishing to know why he does so. A "religion" is a message which claims the right and the power to lay hands on his real existence, (his "private life"), to take captive his whole being, and make of him a new messenger and soldier.

Twenty years ago there was a fight of philosophies; today there is a struggle of "religions". The "religions" which the Christian theologians of the last generation studied and discussed in their relation to Christianity were, either the dead "religions" of the old world, or the "religions" of the Near and Far East. These "religions" challenged the Christian historian or missionary sharply enough; but the questions which they raised did not force themselves upon the mind of "Christianity" as a whole or of all Christians individually. This situation has changed as a result of the appearance of absolutely new "religions".

Genuine (Russian) *Communism*, with its theory of the sovereignty of almost the exclusive existence of the "working class" as the absolute standard and goal of all things, claiming supreme sacrifice and excluding all other claims — real

Communism is fundamentally different from the very moderate and discreet movement which we knew, and still know, as "social democracy". Communism is a "religion", such as has not perhaps entered the lists against Christianity since the days of the old Mohammedanism. International *Fascism*, with its "race, people, nation!" is what it is, precisely because of its religious and non-philosophical characteristics, of its fixed, dogmatic consciousness of the one, national reality, of its appeal to reasons, which are no reasons, of its assumption of absolute authority, of its restriction of liberty and lack of intellectuality, so strange to all of us who were educated twenty years ago. An attitude of contempt or ridicule toward such figures as Mussolini or Hitler, which fails to perceive that a new and at the same time age-old natural religion is at work in their respective movements, misses the point completely.

But a third form of "religion" has come to fruition in our times, less conscious, less obtrusive and less unified than the first two, but perhaps for that very reason all the more effective: "*Americanism*", which imposes its standard of uniformity upon every section of the globe, "*Americanism*" with its gods — health and comfort — whose divinity to their followers is beyond discussion and whose service is to them as natural as breathing, not even requiring reflection. This "religion" is characterised by a naïve egoism combined with brilliant technique and with a primitive but unshakably optimistic morality. It may well be the strongest of the three "religions" we have mentioned, because neither of the others is so self-dependent, so plausible, so easy and cheerful to live up to.

And it is certainly not merely by chance that, just at the present time, the well known historical "religions" of the East, especially Mohammedanism, seem to have taken on fresh life. They wish to be taken seriously, as "religions" (with all the authoritative, essentially enigmatic power characteristic of religion). They call an almost insuperable "Halt!" to Christian missions in various places. In the form of curious, religious mixtures (anthroposophy!), they strike new roots right in the midst of the old realm of



"Christianity". In short the old religions have once more come to the fore and taken their place side by side with the new "religions", which have recently come to light.

The first question which faces "Christianity" today seems to me, therefore, to be : does it realise and understand this situation ? Does it understand, that it is faced, not by a godless world (the talk about the "secularism" of the modern world rests on a fatal misunderstanding !) but by a world of which it must be said : " I observe at every turn that you are a most religious people " (Act 17:22). Does it understand, that today it is no longer surrounded by so many disputable, relative, unbinding and therefore not really serious "philosophies", but rather by so many extremely significant "religions" to which it must give answers, such as "Christianity" has to give to other "religions" not such as it usually gives to this or that undesirable "philosophy of life" ?

The second question is consequently : is "Christianity" aware that it has nothing to expect from these strange "religions" but war to the knife ? This cannot be said of the philosophies. They struggle against "Christianity" only if and when they are "religions" in disguise. As to the "religions" they are able to practise mutual tolerance. Bolshevism and Mohammedanism, Fascism and "Americanism", will one day discover one another, and can learn much from one another. A Hitlerite can become a Communist, or vice versa, without radically changing : he has changed gods, which really *can* be changed. But when the "religions" encounter "Christianity" they become merciless. In face of "Christianity" they have to justify all their most sacred rights, namely their very existence as religions. For "Christianity" challenges the divinity of all gods, and with them the seriousness of all religiosities. It does not proclaim a god, who by his very name betrays himself as a power of nature or of the human mind, and thereby as only one god among others ; "Christianity" proclaims *the* God. When the God, Who created heaven and earth, and before Whom man, with all his natural and spiritual possibilities, stands as a lost sinner, has revealed Himself, the absolute authorities on which the "religions" live are thereby annihilated.

This is what the "religions" cannot pardon in "Christianity". The only possible attitude which "religion" as such can adopt with regard to "Christianity" is that of the imperialist religion at the end of the Roman era: the persecution of Christians. If anything testifies to the sincerity of Communism in Russia, it is the fact that its attitude is exactly analogous to the example just given. But it is not a question of the prospect of bloody or bloodless "persecution". What "Christianity" ought to realise today is: that it has antagonism, and nothing but antagonism, to expect from all "religions", whatever their name or policy. The reason for this antagonism being, that "Christianity" is their natural opponent, because it attacks them by its very existence, and calls them all — as no "religion" does to another — to make an unconditional surrender, because between "Christianity" and them every common ground, every possibility for discussion and hence of understanding, has been cut off. Only by overlooking essentials, by a slight misunderstanding on the one hand or the other, can one be a Communist *and* a Christian, a Fascist *and* a Christian, an "American" (an European American!) *and* a Christian. The others realise this too, even if they do not put the alternatives as sharply as genuine Communism does. But "Christianity" ought to realise it definitely and completely. It ought to realise that the "religions" which surround it are *hostile* to it in spirit, in principle, in will and in "dæmon", and that it can expect no tolerance from them, because it can grant them none.

This brings us to the third question: does "Christianity" know how great is the temptation to avoid the threatening conflict with the other "religions" by a slight disloyalty to its own cause? Does it understand, that that must not happen? We might simply ask: does it understand that it must on no account howl with the wolves? The "religions" are open to good advice, if one knows how to advise them, if one does not refuse them the few grains of incense required to seal the betrayal. Fascism has everywhere found a "Christianity", which was quite ready to come to an understanding with it on the divinity of "race, people, nation". In Russia, where things are most acute, a



corresponding form of "Christianity" seems also to be possible. "America" has even found a form of "Christianity", which has been willing to be built right into its own system. This disloyalty is only a matter of a few adaptations and concessions. How easy it is to adapt "Christianity" in such a way, that a share in the dignity of the One God is given to the "working class" or to the "nation" or simply to the healthy, contented human individual. How easy it is to leave unsaid, or render harmless, certain things in "Christianity" which represent its aggressive attitude to all "religions". Three years ago we saw an international Christian missionary conference (in Jerusalem!) devoting weeks not so much to the understanding of the Gospel as to the "values" of the non-Christian religions. During the World War we saw how the "Christianity" of every country succeeded in adapting itself to the dogma of the standard religion at that time. The same thing has happened over and over again during the preceding centuries. Does "Christianity" understand that this temptation is besetting it again today, and perhaps with more force than ever before? In the midst of the confusion and difficulty of our times, the Christian message ought to be proclaimed in all its purity, not confused with the voices of other religions. It might be that the whole existence of the Christian Church, which people are trying to strengthen by building bridges from it to the other religions, depends on whether it refrains from building such bridges and whether "Christianity", with its message of the One God and His mercy for sinners, may pass through the midst of all "religions", whatever they are called and whatever consequences may be involved, without yielding to them one hair's breadth. Ought and can Christianity, rightly understanding the other religions and itself, do anything but continue the attack on them, which belongs to its very essence? Ought and can Christianity's answer to the "religions" be anything but: mission? Not propaganda, which deals with human "needs" and adapts itself to them, but mission which tells man to his face, that he misunderstands his own deep "needs", if he seeks to satisfy them in those "religions", that his alleged absolute loyalty to the

"god" of that religion is a delusion, from which he can and must rouse himself — a mission which tells men what God has revealed and what man must hear, *because* God has revealed it. Christianity would thus prove at least one thing : that it *believes*, as the other "religions" cannot possibly believe to be true of themselves, that its message rests on divine revelation and not on a human "it seems to me" — however deep and powerful. Whatever is based on such an "it seems to me" is finally a subject for parleying, however vehemently the "religions" may deny the fact. But revealed truth admits of no parley. Why should "Christianity" parley since it believes in revealed truth ?

But this brings us to the last and most difficult question of all. The present-day situation, the conflict with the old and new "religions", brings "Christianity" face to face with the question, whether it has understood itself ? Whether its message, in contrast to that of the "religions", is really the Christian message ? And whether it believes and fully believes and adequately proclaims this message, never ceasing its attack on other religions, never pausing in its missionary efforts ? If it has rightly understood its own essence, it cannot be content to remain merely "Christianity", "Christendom". These terms would stamp it as merely one "religion" among others. Perhaps not even that, perhaps merely a "philosophy of life", and in that case certainly inferior in force to the "religions". Does "Christianity" realise, that it is something different, something more than all the philosophies *and* "religions" can be ? Does it realise that it is the Church of the One God, the Church of Jesus Christ, the Church of the God Who has mercy on those who go astray ? We can here only briefly summarise, what this would mean. A "Christianity" which understood itself as the *Church*, would wish to be the one place where *man* listens and *God* speaks in the midst of a world of loquacious and brilliant "religions". For that is the point of revelation : that it makes us dependent on listening well, listening again, and listening better. In regard to the "religions", the mission would have to begin with the acknowledgment by "Christianity" that it knows what the



preachers of the "religions" do not know : that man, in the service of the One, true God is a poor wretch, who has not discovered God, and who never will discover Him ; but who can only wait until God shall reveal Himself to him. Realising this plight, the Christians ought to realise their solidarity with Communists, Fascists and the followers of all other "religions". They are united in a common need which contains, however, only one hope, and united in the same questioning, to which the "religions" — to the curse of mankind — reply with their sinister and false answers. The man who believes in God's revelation, and who thus knows that it is for him to listen and for God to speak, is thereby so to speak automatically united with all men. In the "religions" of other men he will perceive the common need and the common question, of which they are unaware. And being united with other men, he will be able to speak to them with *authority*.

If the Church hears the word of God, then it is a true Church, and not a propaganda society. It then has a definite mission. It has then to say, what must be heard. It need not remain silent, for it *must* speak. It may give offence, because it is obliged to do so. It need then have no anxiety about itself. What such a Church says to men, on either hand, to their pleasure or displeasure, will not be a human law, but the *Gospel*. Such a Church will preach forgiveness, and no other obedience than that which arises out of forgiveness. It will not hold up a Christian "system" in contrast to the other religious systems. It will not assert itself against them, as the "religions" assert themselves against one another. But, as it speaks with authority, it will proclaim the message of freedom : freedom of conscience and freedom for one's fellow-men, freedom of which man has been deprived by the "religions" and which can only be restored to him by the One, true God. It will not preach this freedom as an ideal, but as God's Christmas gift to men : "You are allowed to free yourselves from the bondage of false gods, for you are already liberated". It will preach grace as grace.

But is this what "Christianity" is doing ? Is that its position, its method and its message ? Does it realise, that

it is the Church of Jesus Christ? Does it wish to be His Church? This question faces "Christianity" today more urgently than ever before. I have only one more thing to add: that this question can be understood by anyone, to the extent to which he understands its application to his own life.

## Theokratie und Kirche

G. J. HEERING

Die soziale Aufgabe der Kirche, in welcher ihre Friedensaufgabe einbegriffen ist, ist eine Frage des Glaubens und der Theokratie. „Dein Wille geschehe auf Erden wie im Himmel“ ist das Geleit- und Glaubenswort der christlich aufgefassten Gottesherrschaft.

Der mittelalterlichen Anschauung nach war die sichtbare Kirche die irdische Gestalt des Gottesreiches. Der Staat verkörperte zwar eine andere Ordnung, die Schöpfungsordnung, die Ordnung des Rechts, aber er war (in Folge der Lehre der zwei Schwerter) der Gnadenordnung, mit welcher er in einem *corpus christianum* vereinigt war, untergeordnet. Die beiden *civitates*, die *civitas Dei* und die *civitas terrena* sollten einander helfen, ihre von Gott gestellten Aufgaben auf Erden zu erfüllen. So sollte (nach verschiedenen Stufen) „die Gerechtigkeit“, das theokratische Prinzip Gregor VII. realisiert werden.

*Mutatis mutandis* war letzteres auch der soziale Gedanke des reformierten Protestantismus. Viel strenger noch, wie die elastische Römische Kirche es getan hatte, stellte die Reformierte Kirche den Staat und die Gesellschaft (Zürich, Genf) unter das Gesetz und die Jurisdiktion des göttlichen Wortes. Diese straffe Theokratie aber konnte nicht dauern, besonders nicht in den grossen Staaten. Die Theokratie erschlaffte und gab den weltlichen Ansprüchen des modernen Staates mehr und mehr nach. Die Lutherische Kirche lebte von Anfang an in zu grosser Abhängigkeit von der Obrigkeit, von der sie sich selbst (in der Lehre von den zwei Regimenten, welche sorgfältig unterschieden werden sollten) zu weit



trennte. Sie tat das in nicht genügend fundiertem Vertrauen auf den christlichen Charakter der „providenziellen“ Regierung. Das *corpus christianum* war ein Bündnis des Vertrauens. So wurde die Lutherische Kirche allmählich der, seiner Position unbewusste, Vasalle des Staates, Vasalle im denken, reden und beten. Wenn sie protestierte, wurde von oben herab diktiert, dass sie schweigen solle: jeder hat sein eigenes Regiment, Staat und Kirche, und Gott lenkt beide. Die Folge war, dass die Kirche sich immer mehr aus dem öffentlichen Leben zurückzog, individualistisch wurde („wie werde ich selig?“) und ihren sozialen Charakter verlor.

Im letzten Jahrhundert wurde die Reformierte Kirche praktisch in dieselbe Lage gedrängt. Der moderne Staat und die moderne Gesellschaft, denen die mittelalterliche, feudale Soziologie der Kirche nicht mehr angemessen war, emanzipierte sich von der kirchlichen Autorität und wurde vollständig säkularisiert. Der bürgerlichen Toleranz und Freiheit wegen vollzog sich — hier früher, dort später — die Trennung von Staat und Kirche; der Staat wurde neutral, die Kirche ziemlich machtlos. Auch in den reformierten Ländern liegt das alte *corpus christianum* (wie weit es früher realisiert wurde, bleibe dahingestellt, aber es war doch eine lebendige Idee) zerbrochen. Die Kirche — besonders die nationale, d. h. die protestantische — ist geistig dem Staate einverleibt und hat im sozial-politischen Leben keine eigene Stimme mehr. Sie stimmt, wenn ihre Stimme gefordert wird, mit dem nationalen Chorus ein und kennt offenbar kein anderes soziales Pathos als das nationale. Ihr sozialer Horizont ist ein irdischer und beschränkter. Ein christlich-soziales Ethos gibt es heute ebenso wenig wie eine christliche Soziologie. Sie müssen um jeden Preis zurückgewonnen werden. Dafür ist aber ein neuer theokratischer Gedanke unbedingt nötig.

Die Trennung von Staat und Kirche war und ist zur Zeit eine Notwendigkeit, besonders in den kirchenreichen Ländern, und vielleicht wird sie es bleiben. Aber niemals darf die Kirche ruhig ansehen, dass auch Staat und Religion getrennt werden. Denn das gefährdet die Idee der Theokra-

tie. Diese Idee ist nicht bloss der Gedanke alter Propheten und überspannter Kirchenfürsten, sondern der unentbehrliche Gedanke jedes prophetischen Glaubens: die Herrschaft Gottes auf Erden. Es ist erstaunlich, dass es noch immer in unseren christlichen Kirchen einen quietistischen Monothismus gibt, der Gottes Providenz so sehr (einseitig-historisch) in der gegebenen Weltlage zu sehen vermag, dass er keiner speziellen Theokratie mehr bedarf: Gott regiert schon, sei es auf unbegreifliche Weise; seine Offenbarung in Christo bezieht sich bloss auf das innere Leben und auf das Jenseits. Oder man macht (die Theologie ist meistens weltgewandt oder weltabgewandt, beide Arten finden einander) den Dualismus zwischen Gott und Welt so scharf, die Kluft so breit, dass auch hier die theokratische Idee verblasst. Alles Irdische ist derselben vernichtenden Kritik unterworfen, Welt bleibt Welt. Man muss sich aber mit der Welt, in der man nun einmal lebt, doch abfinden; man akzeptiert sie einfach und geht weiter. „Es gibt“, sagt Tillich mit Recht, „im Grunde keine ohnmächtigere Art der Kritik als die kritizistische.“ („Wenn alles kritisiert ist, so ist im Grunde nichts kritisiert“.) Denn sie ist „nicht getragen von der Macht einer werdenden Gestalt“. Diese Kritik ist abstrakt, sie lässt die Konkretheit der Propheten vermissen; die wahre christliche Kritik aber ist prophetisch und konkret; sie entscheidet sich auf Erden nicht gegen alles Irdische, sondern sie entscheidet sich für das Eine gegen das Andere. Sicher, alle heiligen Werte werden auf Erden relativ, aber auch das relativ Bessere kann absolut geboten sein.

Alle ernste Arbeit soll „von der Macht seiner werdenden Gestalt getragen werden“. Für den christlichen Glauben ist dieses gestaltende Prinzip die Theokratie. Die Theokratie aber verblasst und wird selber gestaltlos, wenn sie nicht von der Vision der Zukunft Gottes, d.h. des Gottesreiches genährt wird. Ich hatte im vorigen Winter eine merkwürdige Korrespondenz mit einem bedeutenden kalvinistischen Staatsmann. Er sandte mir einen Vortrag, von ihm selbst gehalten, über das Problem, weshalb gerade die Kirche sich so oft der sozialen Reform widersetzt hat. Seine Antwort lautete: weil der christliche Glaube alles, was geschehen ist,



aus Gottes Hand annimmt, und also das historisch Gegebene als Gottes Führung, welche nicht geändert werden darf, betrachtet. (Die zwei grossen politischen Parteien der Orthodoxie in Holland, mit denen die katholische verbunden ist, tragen die kennzeichnenden Namen: die „anti-revolutionäre“ und die „christlich-historische“ Partei.) Er bekämpfte diese konservative Haltung, bohrte aber nicht psychologisch tiefer nach den Wurzeln dieses religiösen Konservatismus. Er ist jedoch ein freier und offener Geist, und als ich ihn fragte, ob unter den Motiven dieses Quietismus nicht auch als negative, aber folgeschwere Ursache diese eine aufgewiesen werden müsse: die Abwesenheit einer prophetischen und deshalb dynamischen Reich-Gottes-Erwartung, da antwortete er: „Ich glaube, Sie haben recht.“

*Die herrschende Orthodoxie, ebenso wie der landläufige Liberalismus unserer Zeit, hat den christlichen Prophetismus verloren. Deshalb hat weder diese Orthodoxie noch dieser Liberalismus eine vorwärtstrebende und reformierende theokratische Idee.* „Der neue Himmel und die neue Erde“, das Reich, in welchem Gerechtigkeit wohnt, lebt nicht in dem protestantischen Glaubensgedanken des europäischen Kontinents; diese Erwartung ist bloss ein Credo-Satz, kein lebendiges Glaubensbekenntnis, keine brennende Hoffnung. Die angelsächsische Zukunftshoffnung mag ebenso wie das amerikanische „Social Gospel“ für unser Bewusstsein zu oberflächlich, zu irdisch gedacht sein, sie sind jedoch in ihrer Religion eine Kraft, ein „Dynamis“. Dieses Dynamis fehlt der unseren. Deshalb fehlt uns die theokratische Idee und die theokratische Sehnsucht. In der katholischen Kirche sind Reich-Gottes-Erwartung und theokratische Idee wenigstens in ekklesiastischer Gestalt anwesend, obwohl auch hier die brennende Hoffnung und die Sehnsucht selten sind. In beiden Kirchen trifft man sie noch am meisten in der Mission.

*Theokratie und Reich-Gottes-Erwartung gehören zusammen.* Die Theokratie ist die irdische Ausdrucksform der himmlischen Erwartung. Theokratie ist *Vorbereitung, nicht Aufbau* des Gottesreiches. Des Gottesreiches harren wir, aber

nicht passiv sondern aktiv. „Bereitet dem Herrn den Weg“. Damit sind zwei Dinge gesagt. Erstens, das Reich Gottes, wird hier auf Erden nie volle Realität, es bleibt Glaube, Zukunft Gottes, welche die irdischen Verhältnisse sprengt. Und zweitens, dieses Reich Gottes ist nicht die Negation, das blosses Gegenteil, das Gegenspiel der irdischen Menschheitslage. Es bedeutet zwar keine blosses Fortsetzung, keine Kontinuität, es gehört einer anderen Ordnung an, und zwischen beiden Ordnungen liegt das Gericht. Aber es gibt heilige Richtung und Anlauf in dieser Richtung, nach diesem Ziel. Denn dieses Ziel, obwohl es Geheimnis Gottes ist, ist nicht ganz und gar unbekannt. Die Offenbarung Gottes in Christo ist auch schon teilweise Offenbarung des Reiches. Wenn wir das Gottesreich nicht durch das grosse Fenster Christi sehen, so sehen wir überhaupt nichts. Und wo der Glaube mit dem Geistesauge nichts sieht, da hat er auch keine Hoffnung. Das Gottesreich ist nicht bloss Hoffnung, sondern auch Vision, und als Vision : Hoffnung. Auf Erden können wir bloss in dieser *Richtung* gehen, leben und arbeiten und die Glaubenden tun dies auch, wenngleich fehlerhaft. Aber dass es eben in Gottes Namen und mit seiner Hilfe geschieht, in *dieser* Richtung, auf das eschatologische Reich hin, das ist die Grösse und der Glanz des irdischen Lebens. Diese Richtung nun ist die Theokratie.

Die Kirche soll sowohl die Realität dieser Welt als auch die Realität des Gottesreiches ins Auge fassen. Dann ist sie von selbst genötigt, und sie fühlt es als ihre Aufgabe, sich darum zu bemühen, dass die Theokratie realisiert werde. Dabei soll sie Verständnis für das haben, was die Theokratie in unserer konkreten Zeit und Weltlage fordert, was sie gebietet und was sie verbietet. Verständnis auch der irdischen Hemmnisse. Diese Bemühung um die Theokratie darf in ihrer Predigt und weiteren Arbeit nicht fehlen. Sonst fehlt ihrer Glaubenshaltung das Merkmal der Wahrschichtigkeit. Ob die Kirche etwas für die Realisierung der Theokratie tun kann, hängt ausser von der Gnade Gottes und ihrem eignen Glauben und Verständnis auch ab von der Frage, wie weit es ihr gelingt, ihre Selbständigkeit dem Staate und der Gesellschaft gegenüber (ohne Selbständigkeit und



Unabhängigkeit kein Einfluss !) zurück zu gewinnen, und Zusammenarbeit der verschiedenen Denominationen, auch internationale Zusammenarbeit, zu verwirklichen.

Internationale Zusammenarbeit. Das ist eine Forderung der unsichtbaren *una sancta ecclesia*, zu der wir uns bekennen. Ich für mich kann für meine Kirche nicht arbeiten, wenn ich sie im Glauben nicht als einen Teil der *una sancta* sehe. Sicher, jede sichtbare Kirche, auch die nationale Abteilung einer internationalen Kirche, wurzelt in der Geschichte des Volkes, und darin liegt die innere Nötigung, priesterlich und prophetisch mit dem Volke zu leben, sich seines Loses anzunehmen. Sogleich soll aber jede Kirche immer bedenken, dass sie ein Teil der *una sancta* ist, die das Evangelium allen Kreaturen zu predigen hat, und dass die „*communio sanctorum*“ nicht bloss die verschiedenen Zeiten, sondern auch die verschiedenen Länder umfasst. Die unsichtbare, aber reelle Glaubensgemeinschaft der *una sancta* sollte als die christliche Internationale der erste Hort der christlichen Theokratie auf Erden sein.

Was diese Theokratie inhaltlich besagt ? Das kann man nicht in wenigen Seiten beschreiben. Wir stecken ausserdem noch mitten drin im Problem der christlichen Soziologie, die vom Grunde (d.h. vom Evangelium) aus, und mit der Hilfe der grossen historischen Zeitgedanken, die wir haben, neu gebaut werden soll. *Aber ein Punkt soll für uns alle feststehen : in diese Theokratie passt kein Krieg.* Der Krieg (ich denke an den für uns reellen Krieg, also an das Scheusal des modernen Krieges) ist die Zerstörung jeder Theokratie, die in Christo ihren Herrn anschaut.

Die Theokratie, die Gerechtigkeit auf Erden, hat sowohl mit Liebe als mit Recht, in allen Dingen mit Glauben zu tun. Insoweit sie Recht ist, und das ist sie hier zum grössten Teil, (denn das Recht ist in dieser sündigen Welt die einzige feste Grundlage des nationalen und internationalen Zusammenlebens) kann sie aus der Ethik des Evangeliums nicht unmittelbar abgeleitet werden. Jedes Recht enthält einen Kompromis, zu dem wir auf Erden genötigt sind. Aber die Theokratie darf, ebenso wenig als das Recht, die christliche

Ethik aus dem Auge verlieren; sie darf die lebendige Verbindung mit ihr nicht aufgeben, sonst hat sie auch keine Verbindung mehr mit dem Reich Gottes, zu welchem sie eine Hinweisung und Anbahnung sein will, sonst hört das Recht auf, Recht zu sein. Der Kompromis ist der so hoch wie möglich stehende, in der Spannung der zwei Komponenten begriffene Ausgleich zwischen den Geboten des Evangeliums und den Forderungen der harten Wirklichkeit in einer sündigen Welt. (Ein solcher Kompromis ist z. B. die Rechtsgewalt der Polizei). Niemals aber darf er die bloße Autokratie dieser Forderungen sein, sonst ist er kein Kompromis, kein Ausgleich mehr, sondern die auf dem niedrigsten Niveau stehende und spannungslose Niederlage. Eine solche radikale Verneinung aller christlichen Ethik ist der Krieg.

Die christliche Ethik ist selbstverständlich vom christlichen Gottesglauben und deshalb vom christlichen Gottesbild durchaus abhängig. Was enthält dieses Gottesbild? Kurz gesagt, es enthält drei Hauptzüge:

1. „Absolute Souveränität“, ausgedrückt in Allmacht und Gericht.
2. Heilige Liebe, in Christo offenbart.
3. Das Reich Gottes wird kommen durch Seine Allmacht, durch Sein Gericht, durch Seine Liebe.

Diese Hauptzüge des christlichen Gottesbildes fordern als Hauptprinzipien der christlich-sozialen Ethik (1) Anerkennung des Anrechtes Gottes auf unser Leben; (2) Achtung für den Mitmenschen, den Gegenstand der Liebe Gottes; (3) Einheit in Gott, dem einen Herrn und Vater, und in Christo, dem Sohne, dem heiligen Bruder; (4) Denken und Beten, Leben und Sterben auf das kommende Reich gerichtet: „Dein Reich komme“, das Reich von „Gerechtigkeit, Friede und Freude in dem Heiligen Geist.“

„Wer darin Christo dient“, sagt Paulus, „der ist Gott gefällig und den Menschen wert.“ Man kann es auch so sagen: der ist ein Diener der christlichen Theokratie auf Erden.



Nun ist es ohne weiteres klar, dass der Militarismus diese Prinzipien weder anerkennen noch aufrecht halten kann, sondern gezwungen ist, sie zu zertreten. Denn das letzte Ziel ist hier nicht das Reich Gottes, sondern das irdische Reich. Die Regierung dieses Reiches, der oberste Kriegsherr ist souverän. Absoluten Gehorsam nicht den Geboten Gottes sondern der Heeresleitung und dem militärischen Befehl gegenüber. Deshalb ist auch die Hingabe nicht rein. Man ist bereit, sein Leben zu opfern, aber man probiert doch energisch, es zu retten und zugleich das Leben anderer zu opfern. Die Einheit der Menschen und der Glaubenden wird nicht anerkannt, sondern radikal verneint, sonst kann man sie nicht töten. Das „Vater Unser“ kann man nicht beten, weil schon die ersten Worte „Unser Vater“, eine Lüge sein würden. Wo die Bruderschaft nicht anerkannt wird, hat man kein Recht, Gottes Vaterschaft anzurufen. Die Achtung und Charitas für den Mitmenschen wird strengstens untersagt, sonst könnte man keinen Krieg führen; der Hass und die Verachtung werden systematisch heraufbeschworen. Sie sind ebenso unentbehrlich wie die Kanonen. Gewiss gibt es im Krieg eine schöne Kameradschaft — aber eine beschränkte. Gewiss gibt es Tapferkeit und Heroismus, aber sie sind erstens einem falschen Ziel zugewandt und zweitens nicht nur mit Todes- sondern auch mit Lebensverachtung verbunden. Ausserdem sind die Kriegstugenden immer von den Kriegssünden weit überschattet.

Es handelt sich hier aber um die *Prinzipien*. Wohlan, das letzte Prinzip ist das schlimmste: *die Vernunft, die den Krieg leitet, ist von jeder moralischen Grundlage losgerissen*, sie ist an keine ethische Norm gebunden, ihre einzige Absicht und *ihr einziger Massstab ist der Effekt*, der vernichtende und niederschlagende Effekt. Diese letzte Tatsache, im letzten Krieg unwiderleglich erwiesen, würde schon genügen, um den a-moralischen und dadurch anti-christlichen Charakter des ganzen Kriegsbetriebes zu zeigen. Wenn dem so ist, so kann dieses Mittel nie einem guten Zweck dienen. Es beraubt diesen Zweck jeden sittlichen Wertes. Deshalb kann der Krieg nie im Dienste der Theokratie stehen. Die Kirche aber hat die Aufgabe, die Theokratie zu fördern und darf

schon deshalb keinen Krieg unterstützen, ebenso wenig wie sich ein Christ am Krieg beteiligen darf.

Der Christ kann und muss vielleicht die Mitschuld am Kriege tragen, aber er darf die Schuld nicht durch Teilnahme vergrößern. Man kann nicht bewusst die Sünde als Sünde sehen und zu gleicher Zeit bewusst diese Sünde wollen und tun. Der Mensch, der die Sünde als Sünde sieht, und sie doch will und tut, spielt mit der Sünde, mit seinem Glauben, mit Gott.

Ich weiss, wir entrinnen nie der Schuld und dem Schuldgefühl, aber wir bekennen doch die christliche Wahrheit: der Krieg ist ein Verbrechen gegen die Menschen, eine Sünde gegen Gott, die völlige Zerstörung der Theokratie.

Ich kenne die Spannung, welche öfters zwischen Gerechtigkeit und Frieden besteht. Gerechtigkeit ist ein höheres Prinzip als Friede. Friede ist gar kein „Prinzip“. Es ist nur ein Zustand, der sich auf einem hohen oder niedrigen Niveau befinden kann, je nachdem. Der Friede dieser Zeit steht offenbar auf einem niedrigen Niveau, weil er vom Kriegswillen durchkreuzt und der Ungerechtigkeit voll ist. Diese Ungerechtigkeit ist aber nie durch Krieg zu beseitigen. Jeder Krieg schafft neue Ungerechtigkeit, weil er selbst Ungerechtigkeit *ist*. „Das eben ist der Fluch der bösen Tat, dass sie fortzeugend Böses muss gebären.“ Haben wir davon noch nichts verspürt? *Einen gerechten Krieg gibt es nicht*, schon deshalb nicht, weil eine der ersten Bedingungen, — sowohl der katholischen als auch der protestantischen Moral — die „rechte Weise“ der Kriegsführung (*modus rectus, modus debitus*) nicht erfüllt werden kann. „Einen gerechten Krieg gibt es heute nur in der Idee, nicht in der Praxis“, hat der katholische Friedensbund Deutschlands schon auf seiner Tagung 1924 ausgesprochen.

Unsere deutschen Freunde werden uns vielleicht fragen: „Müssen wir uns also die ungeheure Ungerechtigkeit der einseitigen und abgezwungenen Abrüstung gefallen lassen?“ Meine Antwort ist dieselbe, die ich Ende Februar in der Kundgebung des Versöhnungsbundes einem katholisch-evangelischen Auditorium in Essen und Köln gegeben habe: „Wenn die anderen Staaten das, was sie versprochen haben,



nicht halten, und den Weg der Abrüstung, zu dem sie Deutschland gezwungen haben, selbst nicht gehen wollen, da habt Ihr Deutsche das formelle Recht — wir gestehen das unbedingt zu — wieder aufzurüsten. Aber im Namen der höheren Gerechtigkeit, welche durch den Krieg geschunden wird, im Namen des Evangeliums, das vom Krieg verhöhnt wird, bitten und beschwören wir Euch, macht von diesem Euren Recht keinen Gebrauch und sagt: *non tali auxilio, nicht mit dieser Hilfe!* ”

Es war mir eine wunderbare Freude, dass gerade nach diesen Worten ein stürmischer Beifall ausbrach. Dieser Beifall war nicht bloss Anerkennung der Wahrheit, dass auch die schwerste Rüstung keine Sicherheit bietet, er war auch an erster Stelle Ehre und Huldigung dem Evangelium Jesu Christi dargebracht. Ich sah mein Auditorium mit Ehrfurcht an und dachte: aus *diesem* bedrängten Volke, in *dieser* schweren Notlage, *diese* Stimme des hohen Friedens, *diese* Stimme der Gerechtigkeit! Ihr seid wahrhaft Christen, die getan haben, was Christus uns Kriegsgläubigen, die wir den modernen Krieg selbst die heidnischen Völker gelehrt haben, jetzt mit heiliger Strenge gebietet. Ihr habt *umgelernt!*

Die Theokratie umfasst selbstverständlich mehr als Kriegslosigkeit. Grosszügige Weltpolitik, nationalen und internationalen Solidarismus auf wirtschaftlichem Gebiete, einen reellen tatkräftigen Völkerbund, das alles und viel mehr gehört dazu. So lange aber die Völker meinen: in letzter Instanz helfen wir uns selbst mit Krieg, wird alles noch viel sicherer misslingen, als wenn man meint: wir retten uns mit immer höheren Zollmauern. „Ich erwarte“, hat der oesterreichische Staatsmann und Rechtsgelehrte Heinrich Lammasch geschrieben, „ich erwarte vom nächsten Weltkrieg die Vernichtung und Entvölkerung Europas, die Verwilderung der Nationen, den Untergang der europäischen Kultur.“

Wir müssen alle einsehen, hier ist *periculum in mora!* Der jetzt wieder drohende Weltkrieg — und die politischen Mächte sind offenbar nicht im Stande, ihn aufzuhalten — gefährdet die ganze Möglichkeit der Theokratie auf Erden!

Theokratie und — Krieg. *Hier ist jetzt der Angriffspunkt der Kirche:* das Pathos des Evangeliums gegen das Pathos des Kriege. Die Kräfte der göttlichen Tiefe gegen die Kräfte der dämonischen Tiefe. Das wird immer deutlicher der letzte, entscheidende Kampf. Lehnt die Kirche diesen Kampf ab, da wird mit der Kultur auch sie gerichtet. Weil sie ihrer Aufgabe, die Stütze der Theokratie zu sein, nicht gewachsen war.

## “The Machine-Church”

PAUL SCHÜTZ

### I

What is God's work ? It is the Church. God's work on His creation is closed down. He continues it only indirectly and secretly through the Church. God's creative power is still present in the creation, but it is hidden in the Church. And precisely there — in the Holy Place of the creation where God wants to go on creating — is the home of “religious activity”. What does it want ? It wants to “make” a Church.

Let us realise what this means. Let us impress the fact on our minds, that on the virgin-soil, over which God the Creator walks, man is standing and wanting to “make” a Church.

In his novel *On the Puppet-Theatre* Heinrich von Kleist relates, how a famous dancer confided to him the secret of his art. He had learnt it from the puppets in the puppet theatre. A puppet dances more gracefully than any human body. Its limbs are dead ; they are nothing but pendulums ; it is only owing to the discovery of the correct point of gravity that they become so graceful in movement. Our soul, says the dancer, has lost the secret of gravity in movement. Consciousness has taken control of the limbs. Consciousness



is a centre of gravity "*of later construction*". It wishes to regain, by artificial means, what was possessed only by Nature in its pristine state : gracefulness. The dancer thought this inevitable, since man ate of the tree of knowledge in Paradise. And he believed that in order to understand these things, one should carefully read the third chapter of the first Book of Moses.

That is the wisdom of the poet. Deliberate consciousness, which knowledge always awakens, attempts to construct artificially the gracefulness which is the exclusive gift of Nature. Gracefulness is the *gratia* of Mother Earth. The simile teaches, that "religious activity" means nothing less than the loss of grace. One cannot deliberately determine to be graceful. How much less can one deliberately set about *obtaining* the grace of God ! The intention to carry on religious activity is equivalent to the intention to *obtain* grace. There is no religious activity without such intention. The Church and grace come into the sphere of human planning and the work of God Himself is anticipated.

To world missions, and to the œcumenic movement, for example, this planning lends the sureness and clearness of rational construction. They are purposeful plans, on a large scale. Here grace is treated as a disponible quantity. If this is denied it indicates simply a bad conscience. These great systems of religious activity become meaningless without the presupposition, that grace is *obtainable*, and that man can count on it. These systems *are* indeed grace obtained, made visible, calculated. Like a well of oil, there is also a well of grace, whose store is accessible to the world through the religious "undertakings". It is significant that Methodism arose at the same time as industrial imperialism. The name hits the mark with the careless certainty of linguistic instinct. Grace is obtainable, i.e. universal. The system of religious activity concentrates on the cultivation of the circumstances into *method*. Through this method grace is organised from individual conversion to a universal Mission Church. Both systems are based on artificial construction and show thus that they are built on the ruins of what constitutes real fellowship.

Modern man is the individual man — part of a mass. A technical civilisation holds together this disintegrated human race over the abyss in the iron frame of the collectivity. This framework of technical civilisation is based on that *reflection*, which ignores the essential realities and *builds up*, a secondary and artificial creation. Technical civilisation is man's last hope of saving himself. Violently man tears open the innermost depths of his heart, in order to produce his last bit of force in the hope of saving himself. Since the beginning of the Renaissance until the advent of Bolshevism, the whole armed force of human nature has been mobilised increasingly for this one purpose. Religion too ! Yes, religion most of all ! Religion becomes secular in "religious activity".

In creation the secret of God lies hid ; but creation with her secret is beyond our powers of knowing. We can no longer recognise creation not even in theology. Hence we have to help ourselves out with the uncertain terminology of philosophy. We have to speak of "the residuum of life", "the residuum of existence"; of the "*natura naturans*", an expression which shows a deep recognition of the fact, that the fallen creature is relying on its own resources — that it is God-less. It is only faith which can speak meaningfully of creation. But even in the Church, there has grown up, a mechanised ideology : the system of "religious activity". It is like a brother to the machine-world of technical civilisation. Yes, religion is *proud* of this connection, because it shows the evolution of the Church in a progressive age. Religion wants to be efficient and uses technical means on a large scale. Christian activity is organised with the help of the capitalist system, and with a mammonist pragmatism as its dynamic force. No one, whether within or without, seems to be frightened by the claim implied in such activity. The Kingdom of God is systematically organised as a "job". It is a canalisation of salvation, a great irrigation-system, carrying the means of salvation to the uttermost ends of the earth. The ideals, projects, constructions, collaborations and organisations of religious activity imitate the national and international kartels, trusts and mutual-benefit-societies



of the economic sphere. Since the end of the Reformation they have covered the earth so thickly, that the machinery hides the furrow and we have lost sight of the fact, that it is not this gigantic work of religious activity but the earth itself, to which the promise has been given. Our thoughts go to the Roman Catholic system of religious activity and to its counterpart in Neo-Protestant enthusiasm. These two systems — which are apparently in contradiction — join forces in a common attempt to extend their dominion around the world and to enter the realm of politics. In religious activity an artificial, “secondary” creation has arisen, which covers up the rests which remain of original creation.

*The machine-man* : thus was the age stamped from birth, by a remarkably modest and far sighted judgment. The Machine-Church is its inevitable companion. A world in which organisation has become a religion and a marvellously developed system of “religious activity” go hand in hand. In the Reformation the Western Church had looked back for the last time to the Early Church. In the mirror of Scripture it had recognised the true Church. But in the Counter-Reformation which took place in Protestantism as well as in Catholicism the man of the Renaissance, the self-confident man of modern times, came on the scene in order to “construct” the truth which had been lost. This was only natural since modern creative man believed that he could find God within his own being and that he possessed the “inner light” and the “inner word”. When the Church fails the sects find fertile soil. The business of the Church became a *wholesale* business. “Missions” are carried on by men, there is therefore never a lack of missionaries. Every sect becomes a “Church”. And the remains of the Church become yet another sect. For the sect is an “organised” Church. And an “organised” Church always remains a sect, and may be clearly recognised as such even if it covers its nakedness by calling itself a “Universal Church”.

## II

According to the story of the building of the Tower of Babel, God Himself caused the confusion of tongues. And what God Himself confused can only be re-united by Him. Everything that man undertakes for this purpose amounts merely to the building of another Tower of Babel which results in fresh confusion.

The story of Pentecost teaches, that the problem of language can only be solved through the miracle of tongues, i.e. by creation, for the Spirit is the creator. Today we have lost the understanding of this secret of language. Speech is the only possibility of understanding each other. And the fact that this understanding — i. e. speech — fails us explains our loneliness. It fails us even in the most tender relationships of life. The breakdown of marriage, of friendship, of professional comradeship, the acuteness of the problem of leadership and of the generations, the class and race struggle, the general destruction of confidence in the social sphere, are all catastrophes of speech. It is, however, the very same generation which felt in its inmost being the crippling of the power of speech, which is preparing a universal system for mutual understanding. It is just because so little power of speech has survived that this superficial process is possible. What remains is no more than a bit of worn-out coinage. Since its inscription is half-effaced everyone is allowed to cash it at the interpreters' exchange bank. This remnant of common speech is a system of interchangeable ideas, which is coming more and more into use for practical international purposes and which becomes a polished and increasingly useful tool.

The logic of this mechanical language-residuum forces those who use it to confine their understanding to practical things, even in the intellectual and spiritual realm. One must have been working in international circles for some time, in order to understand, how small the circle becomes when



all must be limited to definite "practical" matters, for the sake of efficiency.<sup>1</sup>

But it is precisely when *truth* is at stake, that the weakness of speech even between Germans and Germans becomes apparent, not to mention that between those who speak different languages. Congresses and commissions achieve little more than to preserve the fiction of spiritual fellowship through the help of the mechanical residuum of speech. How close is the relationship in mentality and history between Germans and Russians! Yet how difficult it is, even between those two nations only, to start a real discussion in which, in agreement or in opposition, they may struggle for truth, with the firm intention not to sacrifice their masculine desire for truth to the temptations of a womanly sympathy. The *more practical* the matter which is to be dealt with, the more closely the ideology is "standardised" on human lines, the more languages can be coordinated on the surface of that ideology. But when we apply the test of reality we find that the appearance of understanding ceases to be "world-wide" and narrows down to a sober conversation between two diplomats in two languages "tête-à-tête", in which the destinies of nations are determined. There — in the reality of political life — when destinies are at stake, the real roots of existence are shaken. Then the confusion of tongues cannot be ignored. For it simply must be recognised as human destiny. Reality stands behind the speakers in the form of war.

Diplomats can speak together! So can organisers of industry and workmen; philanthropists, pacifists, social revolutionaries and nationalists of all countries! It is only the Churches which cannot speak to one another. They must unite in the solidarity of their powerlessness. Only then will they bear witness to that, to which they alone can bear witness. Their testimony about the confusion of tongues, is equally a testimony about its solution — namely the miracle of the Pentecostal Church. Only then do they accomplish *their*

---

(1) The strength of "*Stockholm*" was precisely in its practical character. This corresponded to the limited possibilities of international superficiality. In "*Lausanne*" it was the practical task of reunion which provided the foundation of the conference and rendered it attractive. It is significant that the discussion on "order" did not succeed because of the contradiction of "faith".

action, and carry out what has been entrusted to them. Let them render unto the world the things which are of the world. The world lives by law, or by force — which is the same thing. But the Church lives by grace.

This is why the Pentecostal Church is — Christian. To the Pentecostal Church belongs the Church of all ages, in so far as it acknowledges the miracles of tongues, without replacing it by organisation.

Through grace. There is a force, which cannot live side by side with grace; it is the force by which the world lives (and quite legitimately!) and which is known as “law”.

Organised religious activity is possible only on the basis of law. It is the embodiment of law. The commandment is an acute form of law. Religious activity sharpens the law to a commandment! It is the religion of the new Synagogue. By force of inner necessity it leaves the frame of the Church, and creates sects, which branch out enthusiastically into the secular sphere, in the organisations “outside of” and “above” the Church — in the “political-religious” factions. Organised religious activity follows its natural inclination towards secularism, the point at which law, in the State, exists in its own right. When grace fails, then the iron dialectic of fallen creation assumes undisputed control: law becomes master in the Church.

“Religion” is always a religion of law. No religion exists except through law. When it clamours for a “commandment”, the Church has already sunk to the level of a “religion”.

The real Church proclaims the message of the Cross. And the law passes away. There is no activity beneath the Cross, for activity is power and seeks power; and that is always *human* power. The world is the home of power — the right home. Hence the Church occupies an indispensable position in the world — indispensable because it is the home not of force but of grace.

### III

Religious activity means the systematising of grace. It believes in the law of causality in spiritual life. It might even be called the system of technical causes and spiritual effects!



*Grace is the breath of the Spirit, which blows when and whither it will.*

Religious activity means religious planning, continuity, immanence.

*Grace is a resurrection from the dead.*

Religious activity means religious progress, development, enthusiasm.

*Grace is a pause in the march to victory. It is a halt in the sense of being held up. It is the end of all things. It is a new heaven and a new earth.*

## **“The Church Cleans House”**

Buell Gordon GALLAGHER

I begin by saying that I am *in* the Church. I am here partly because I love it and owe the Church a great debt; but even more, I am here because I believe it offers the most promising point of approach to present problems. The editors have asked me to speak only about “the failures of the Church to give a prophetic message for social life”, and while I am, of course, responsible for what I say, I am not responsible for saying it! There is, moreover, much to be said on behalf of institutional religion; as a minister, working in and through the Church, I begin by protesting, that, despite the faults I select for treatment in these pages, the Church appears to me more hopeful than any other institution of society. It is the most likely tool — but the tool needs sharpening, and needs it badly.

What the Church needs is a good spring-cleaning. There is much that clutters up the House of God, stultifying and diverting the efforts of religion. One has seen Cathedrals and Churches which were allegedly dedicated to the Glory of God; but which have become so littered with monuments to, and devices of secular life that the Invisible Presence is lost in the confusion of Visible Presents. Almost one becomes an iconoclast. Emerson saves me with the reminder that a

certain man got rid of the rats in his barn by burning the barn. It is not house-wrecking, but house-cleaning, that is needed. Come, let us go up into the House of the Lord, and see what strange devices the children of men have brought into the Temple.

Here we are at the Great West Door — what an imposing facade the Church presents to the world ! It is well calculated to make an impression. Flanking the entrance, and setting the tone for the entire facade, are the devices of *Institutionalism*. The coat of arms is copied in duplicate on both sides of the entrance : an adding machine, rampant, over a Bank Book, open, and a Bible, closed ; with the motto, " My Father's Business ". A certain New York advertising agency once caught the spirit of the modern ecclesiastical sales force when it printed the caption : " The Church Steeple — pointing heavenward — Silently Sells Salvation ! " That is not a wholly incorrect estimate of the impression which the Church makes upon our world — we may not be selling Salvation, which is a free gift of God ; but we are trying to sell something. And by what a galaxy of methods !

There is the effort to build the Church-Going Habit. A dinner for laymen will be addressed by a prominent publicist on " The Old Family Pew Habit ". Slogans, posters, bulletins, electric signs, the mails, will be used to cultivate prospects. Children of all ages will be encouraged with prizes and enameled pins. If the method succeeds, the minister can compliment himself that he has his pews filled — even though with habitual pew warmers. He can also reflect that in the methods he uses, he is on a par with the opium traffic... Another method of drawing the crowd is the " jazzing up " of the Church program. There will be a Snappy Song Service. On occasion, Blaine's Brass Band will play a concert on the street before the service. The Ancient Order of the Sons and Daughters of Retired Coach Drivers will attend a special service in their honor, at which the sermon will be on some appropriate, and not too antagonistic theme — certainly not " The driving is like unto the driving of Jehu, the son of Nimshi ". Men who are particularly clever at it, can keep up this sensationalism for some time before their bag of tricks

runs out and they discover that God had called them to a field of larger usefulness in another town. But even so, these methods are self-defeating ; as has been said, one may draw a crowd by announcing that he will pronounce the Benediction standing on his head under a green umbrella, but the next week he will have to have a greener one.

Different in degree only, from these sales methods, is the prostitution of renascent Church Worship to the god of numbers. Ecclesiastical showmanship is a permutation of ecclesiastical salesmanship. Appropriate millinery and pomp make their impression on the ignorant — how short is the distance between that worship of God which is genuine, and that which, using the same apparatus and technique, is carried on to make an impression on the “ audience ! ” Nor is Beauty the only quality to be used as a sales device. The realm of Truth is notoriously the arena of the proselyter, who makes statistical capital of his theological or christological point of view ; and the struggle for Goodness is marred by the champion of justice who tries to build a class-conscious Church, appealing either to the Masses or the Classes. The fact is that all these devices for building attendance and filling pews and coffers are an expression of a particular idea of God — ecclesiology is often a true index of theology ; and while one hears modern philosophers speak of God as the Great Mathematician, one has yet to hear of any person of repute who will defend this god whom the modern Church serves — the Great Statistician. Theology lags behind ecclesiology. Or is it fear of the truth, which would reveal us as concerned with the wheels within wheels, and forgetful of the spirit of the Living Creature in the wheels — is it fear of being disclosed as mechanics rather than prophets and priests which keeps us from admitting that we serve the adding machine ? The Institutionalists will always be concerned with bigger and better monuments to the egotism of man ; the instrumentalists are concerned with making the Church a fitting tool for the work of God.

But come ! Enter, and see what is behind this imposing facade of worldly Success. The great nave should give us an uninterrupted view of the high altar... What are all these



partitions which divide it into hundreds of booths and stalls and little rooms ? In the *Heiligegeistkirche* in Heidelberg, there is one great partition which separates the Catholics in the chancel from the Protestants who have the nave ; but here, there are over two hundred little rooms, each with its quota of devotees who seem to think that God can hear them only when they enter their own particular walled-off section of the Temple. So much time and effort have to be spent building, repairing, and defending the partitions, that there seems to be little time left to get on with the worship of God or the work for God outside the Temple.

Picking our way through this maze of partitions (it rivals the penitent's path in the paving-stones of Chartres), we approach the chancel. With a facade of Institutionalism, and a nave given over to Denominationalism, what can we expect to find in the sanctuary ? The ego-maximation expressed in the facade and the nave has its apotheosis here. Despite the good intentions of priests who engaged their architects and builders to express the standards of Secularism in other parts of the great Cathedral, expecting to reserve the chancel for things sacred, even this holy of holies has been invaded by the atmosphere of profanity. The self-secreted standards of the world, expressed in the prostitution of the institution to Jumbo and the partition of the institution by mint-tithers, are the dubious virtues of Secularism which has excluded the Church from the world and has ended by invading the very holy of holies. The world has conquered the Church.

“ This is the result of letting the Church get mixed up in worldly affairs ; let the Church stay within the realm of the sacred, and cease attempting to mix with the profane ” — so we are told. We are told that the sacred and the profane exist side by side in mutually exclusive compartments and that any interpenetration must be to the detriment of the Church. Such monastic sanctity as would come from following this thesis would have the double effect of purging certain small sections of the Church, and of affording prophecy by example. Certainly, it would be better than compromise through which the institutions of religion are permeated with

sub-Christian standards. Yet retreat is not conquest. Sometimes it may appear to be individual victory; but it cannot be the way for the institution. "They are not of the world... I send them *into* the world". If religion wishes to become normative rather than ancillary, it must build its institutions on sacred, not profane standards... What do you say? Shall we clean house?

Look a little closer. What do you see here in the dim light of the chancel? The spirit of Secularism dominates; is that why the second Commandment is broken? The first image I see is a veritable Apollo — no, Apollo was a Greek; and this image has flaxen hair and blue eyes. It was Voltaire who said that God made man in His own image, and that man is continually returning the compliment. Here it is! The worship of the Nordic God. Why? Listen to this — in a district of New York which is populated largely by Italians and Jews, a teacher in a Daily Vacation Bible School was leaving the building in the company of one of her pupils, an Italian girl. "Gee! How I hate those Jews!" "But don't you know", teacher corrected, "that Jesus was a Jew?" The little girl walked in silence for nearly a block before replying, "Well, may be Jesus was a Jew, but anyhow, God's an Italian". It is the acceptance of standards like that which has put the Nordic image on the high altar of our Church. It makes no difference whether a man's skin is white, blue, pink or green; God made him, and he is God's child. By what right do we limit our Churches to Nordics, as though we were sorting out the sheep and the goats?

The twin of *Nordicism* is *Nationalism*. This is the god to whose glory the flags hang from the clerestory of this great Cathedral. And the curious thing about these bits of bunting is that no matter who looks at them, he sees that every flag there is the flag of his own nation. A weird perversion of Pentecost, this! Perhaps the opening of the Bible might help. One does not recall reading the words of Jesus, "Render unto Caesar, the things that are God's". With the calming of emotions since the Great War, true insight denies the lies of Nationalism which told us that the God who is no respecter of persons, is nevertheless a respecter of nations.

The institutions of a universal religion must at all times serve the highest good of humanity. When the various States are in harmony with this common good, the States may claim the active support of the Church; but the Church Universal cannot consent to be the tail of the nationalistic kite. Not that we love Caesar less; but that we love Christ more.

The decision between Christ and Caesar involves also the decision between Christ and Mars; for Mars is the third of the pagan gods enthroned in the sanctuary. Let a war come, and the pulpits of the land become recruiting stations; all the ecclesiastical facilities are at the disposal of the military. Some may be reluctant; but the recalcitrant are speedily silenced. Why should it be so difficult for the Church to see that the whole sorry business of hiring innocent boys to kill other innocent boys cannot be covered over with the pretence of religious sanctity to make the mass assassination appear more acceptable? Once again — shall we clean house?

Take one more look... The very altar cross has been displaced by an image. The symbol of God's sacrifice has been displaced by the symbol of man's acquisitiveness. There it sits, that smiling, golden image of Mammon. It was not ever thus. The Primitive Church tried, however erroneously, to make its economic life a sacrament of its spiritual life. The Mediæval Church tried, however ineffectually, to regain this ability to order economic activity according to a Christian ethic. The Reformers, notably Calvin, tried to carry this economic ethic of Catholicism right on in the Protestant Church. But all branches of the Church failed to keep abreast of the rapid developments of the economic world — world markets, a financial economy, and then the Industrial Revolution. So that while the Church did not deliberately abrogate its right to establish or criticise the ethic of economic activity, the new channels of commerce and industry and finance were outside the area which the limited purview of the Church included. The result is that the present industrial, financial, and commercial systems have grown up with only such standards as expediency, taste, and common decency have been able to establish. And the Church, depending on this world both for its membership and its



revenue, has, as Mr. R. H. Tawney points out, become the sanctimonious adjunct of a Mammon-serving world. Perhaps it is not altogether remarkable that this should be so, for the leaders of the Church have always had a decided leaning toward the greediness after filthy lucre against which the apostle warns. And it is significant that the thing which stirred the anger of our Lord and led Him to clean house was this same profanation of the House of Prayer for the profit of Mammon.

As we stand here in this strange and fearful Cathedral of the imagination, representing the Nightmare of ecclesiasticism, and look about upon the desecration of the Temple by Institutionalism, Denominationalism, Secularism, Nordicism, Militarism, Nationalism, and Mammonism, the impulse to clean house becomes irresistible. These seven devils are the delightful playmates of the once-exorcised Ecclesiastical Selfishness which returned to find the house swept and garnished, and called them in. If house-cleaning is to be effective, we must enthrone the Invisible Presence, and serve Him. It may also be that we should remember that house cleaning does not bring the Spring... and that the Nightmare should be followed by the Day Dream.

## The Catholic Revival in the Church of England

ERIC FENN

It is with great hesitation that I have written this article, and I must preface it with a word or two of explanation. I belong to the religious tradition which has its roots in Calvin. This tradition is, I believe, the one most definitely opposed to Catholicism, for Calvin gave us a dogmatic scheme and a theory and form of the Church, which in definiteness of outline and effectiveness of working can vie with the Catholic system. I am a Protestant, writing about a Catholic revival.

The scope, therefore, of what I attempt is severely limited. I am outside the situation about which I write. I can only seek to appreciate; I can never hope to expound. Even what I do attempt must seem presumption, for to understand Catholicism you must be a Catholic. To know the inwardness of Catholic symbolism, you must worship in the Catholic way, and to evaluate Catholic discipline you must have submitted yourself to it.

However, it is worth taking risks in the attempt to set down the salient features of a movement of which I am not a member, in a Church other than my own, for three reasons: first, because the Catholic revival is a very real force for good and for ill in British life; second, because I rejoice in friends and colleagues who belong to this revival and from whom I have learnt too much ever to doubt the strength and power of that which I do not share; third, because, in common with many other young Protestants, I feel that the movement raises for us certain searching questions as to our own traditions, which cannot be avoided. Here there is being made at least one attempt to answer a secularised world. What is our own answer to be?

In the first place it is important to note that what is called Anglo-Catholicism is a *revival*. It is a recent and vigorous reassertion of an element in the life of the Church of England which in some form or other has always been there; and in that sense it is not new. The Church of England is a complex body, bewildering enough to ordinary Englishmen and probably incredible to the Continental. To understand it at all we must briefly glance at its history.

The English Reformation was a mixture of politics and religion, and it is very difficult to assess the amount of each, or indeed to know when you are dealing with the one and when with the other. The final break with Rome under Henry VIII was deeply involved with the question of kingship and the royal succession. A very high doctrine of kingship was emerging: to secure the succession Henry must have a male heir and therefore he must be able to remarry. When the break was made the religious issues came into prominence, because of divided loyalties. The clergy, and especially

the monastic orders, had to change from obedience to the Pope to obedience both temporal and spiritual to the King, and this was not achieved without violence. Yet, while beneath all the reasons of State there lay the same popular unrest as Luther found elsewhere, in England there was never the same clean break with the past, and ritual and doctrine were taken over from the Catholic Church. Subsequently the real force of the Reformation struck the Church in the reign of Edward VI and a deliberate attempt was made to blot out Catholic practice. Then the reign of Mary I planted in us that deep hatred and fear of Rome which is so characteristic of the English people, and from the time of Elizabeth onwards the Anglican Church, safe from this peril of a return to Roman dominion, was free to contend with its own chequered destiny. It was chequered, for there was always the fear of Rome, and there was also the rising tide of Puritan dissent. Under the first two Stuarts the tension between these two forces led to a developed doctrine of the kingship, linked with Catholic traits in the Church. Then came the Civil War and the triumph of Puritanism during the Commonwealth; the monarchy and a national Catholicism going down before democratic Calvinism. The Restoration was a reaction from this to the older tradition, still marked by fear of Rome on the one hand and hatred of dissent and Puritanism on the other. The Church must be Catholic and reformed; and above all free from domination from without.

So we entered the XVIIIth century. Apart from certain famous and able men such as Berkeley, Law and Butler, and many faithful and unknown parish priests, it was a time of sterility and spiritual death, when Erastianism became political jobbery of the worst kind. And from this period of living death the Church was awakened by two revivals. The first, in the XVIIIth century, resulted in schism and the formation of the "Methodist Connection" — one of the best organised and most popular of the so-called "Free Churches". The second, in the XIXth century, was known as the "Oxford Movement", and gave rise to the Catholic Revival within the Anglican Communion.

The point to note in this brief historical survey is that,



with the possible exceptions of the reign of Edward VI and the Commonwealth, the Church of England has preserved a Catholic action, and has always claimed to be both Catholic and Reformed. The representatives of this Catholic strain have been the "High Church Party", nationalistic, conservative and even reactionary in politics and governed by the need to steer a difficult course between Rome on the one hand and dissent on the other. Up to the Methodist Revival the other section was the "Low Church Party", liberal in politics, prepared for rapprochement with dissent, and deeply influenced by the Continental Reformation. The Methodist Revival, although ending in schism, produced within the Anglican Church a new, non-political religious force of the first importance — the Evangelicals. Then, later, the Oxford Movement, remaining within the Church in spite of constant tension, transformed completely the character of the old "High Church Party".

The early leaders of the Catholic Revival — men like Newman, Pusey and Keble — sought to re-emphasise certain elements in the original Catholic tradition, such as the spiritual independence and authority of the Church, and the centrality of the Sacraments. They did so by pointing out that the formularies and traditions of the Church were richer in Catholic elements than was realised and more consonant with Catholic practice than was admitted. Subsequent development made many far-reaching changes.

The governing idea underlying the Catholic Revival is undoubtedly the conception of the Church as a supernatural organism, constantly sustained and nourished by the Holy Spirit of God. Just as God embodied Himself in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, so that first Incarnation is extended and made permanent in the Church. As Jesus owes His significance to the fact that "in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily", so the Church is no mere concourse of like-minded individuals, but a visible, organised society which is the vehicle of the Holy Spirit, God-created and God-sustained. And the form of the Body of Christ is not contingent. It is given. Jesus did not found a society and leave it free to develop its own organisation according to the

exigencies of the moment. He planted a seed in which were all the potentialities of definite form. In its growth the resulting plant was tended, directed and nourished by God; in it the life of God dwelt and worked as really as it dwelt in the body of our Lord. The Episcopate is therefore not a thing of convenience; it belongs to the given-ness of the Church, to its *esse* and not merely to its *bene esse*.

Almost all the other characteristics of Anglo-Catholicism follow from this central conception. There is, for instance, a certain impersonal note in the worship, which often seems cold to the non-Anglican. The human minister is subordinated to the forms of the Church in order that God may act through these forms. Colour, dignity and beauty are employed to the full, that the worship offered may be more worthy of its high object, and also that God may take of these things too, and make them the vehicle of His revelation. The symbolism of vestments, incense and action is used to enrich the service, and the personality of the priest is kept suppressed. He is *not* the Rev. X.Y.Z. He is the official representative of the people, the instrument of the worship of the whole Church; and he is the representative of Christ. This dual office, with its man-ward and God-ward aspects, is priestly rather than prophetic; or rather only prophetic in so far as the whole Church is a prophetic community.

The centre and crown of this worship is the Eucharist. I believe it is true that throughout the Anglican Communion there has been a great increase of late in the number of people who go frequently and regularly to Communion, and I have heard it claimed that this is either a direct or an indirect effect of the Catholic Revival. I can quite understand why that should be so, because of the great emphasis laid in Catholic circles on the Eucharist as the centre of Christian worship. Catholic clergy admonish their people to do two things: to go as often as possible to early Communion (without communicating) and to take Communion at frequent, regular intervals — say, once a week. This is strange to Protestant ears, for we find the high act of Communion possible only at rare intervals; and why go if you are not going to partake?

I am diffident about trying to explain this. Indeed I cannot really attempt to do so. All I can do is to set down certain considerations which make it at least a conceivable course of action, and free it from the charge of superstition.

In the first place, the Eucharist is, for the Catholic, always a miracle. I do not mean that in any merely magical or superstitious sense, but rather in that in which Jesus was a miracle. Just as in Him God took of the things of human nature and gave Himself through them to men, just as the Holy Spirit dwells in the supernatural Body of the Church, so in the Eucharist God breaks anew into this world of time and space through the medium of bread and wine, in order to give Himself to men. Whether you express that in the ancient terms of transubstantiation or in others will not greatly matter. The Catholic conception of the Eucharist is based on the act of God which takes place there.

Secondly, there is a renewed emphasis on the sacrificial element in the Sacrament. Here is the life of God in Christ again offered both to man and to God : to man for his recreation and strengthening and to God in precisely the same way as Jesus gave His life in utter obedience. And that life, to which our own lives are now joined in worship and in the act of Communion, is the only offering we can make to God. It is the summation of the whole life of the Church, just as the Cross was the consummation of the life of Jesus.

Further, Christ is known in the breaking of bread, in the common things of life which are thereby lifted out of the realm of convenience and private possession, are claimed by God, are offered to God and received back as a gift from God. The Eucharist witnesses against and condemns much of our modern life. It calls us to submit the things whereby we live to the power of this renewed Advent, and so to use them that they become and remain the means of God's revelation to men. Because this miracle is there at the heart of the Church the whole of life must be sacramental to those who so worship. And this is the root of the political and social radicalism which marks many sections of the Catholic Revival.

A miracle, a sacrifice, a claim upon the whole of life. Therefore the Eucharist is the supreme moment of worship



in which the presence of Christ is most real, most authenticated, and the claims of God upon us most definite. Preaching will depend on the Spirit which, like the wind, bloweth where it listeth. The fellowship of the Church is at best a diffused reality. Here, in the Sacrament, *guaranteed by Christ Himself*, is the objective Presence on which all else is focussed and from which all else derives its significance. To assist at the Eucharist frequently, whether you communicate or not, is to enter into the depths of worship frequently. To communicate is to offer one's self, not as intrinsically worthy to be offered, but as made worthy by the obedience and death of Christ.

Following from this high conception of the meaning of Communion is the revival of confession as a spiritual preparation for Communion. I cannot go very deeply into this, for it is one of the characteristics of the movement which I understand least. But it is common to many Protestant traditions to make some kind of preparation for that high re-dedication implicit in the Holy Communion. The pre-Communion service in the Presbyterian Church is one such practice — a profound searching of the heart based on so high a doctrine of the Sacrament that infrequent Communion is the general rule. There is nothing inherently wrong in confession, and many a Protestant pastor knows what it means to hear men and women unburden their souls. If you add to that a priestly conception of the Ministry, in which the priest both represents the Church and speaks on behalf of God, absolution becomes a natural consequence.

One could, of course, go on almost indefinitely to speak of penance, marriage, baptism, etc. ; but I have picked out what seem to be the vital salient features of a movement which I only know from the outside. They are a high doctrine of the Church, leading to an emphasis on worship and the priestly conception of the Ministry ; a high doctrine of the Eucharist, giving rise to a sacramental view of life and the centrality of this solemn act of Christian worship and a revival of Catholic discipline. There remain two things to be added before passing to consider the effect of this movement on other religious traditions. First, the revival of Catholic discipline includes Catholic methods of training in private prayers.

The silent retreat, a going aside into directed meditation for two or three days at a time, has become a common form of such training. The methods of Ignatius Loyala and his successors have been examined and adapted. And this definite instruction in the art and method of prayer is without doubt one of the most valuable features of the movement. Then secondly, alongside the high doctrine of the Church, is a very real patience with the frailty of human nature. The Church is a community of those who are *being converted*, and a society of very fallible people who are being redeemed by the power of that Holy Spirit which seeks incarnation in their lives. It is not the congregation of the "once and for all time" converted, nor are the benefits of the Church the prerogative of those who are "good enough".

Anglo-Catholicism is definitely a minority movement, and is not by any means uniform. There are two sections between which there is tension — those who look to Rome for inspiration and guidance, and those who look back into the Anglican tradition for their models. But in essence it is neither a return to mediævalism nor a slavish copying of Rome. At its best the movement is prepared to look with clear eyes at the past and at present-day Roman Catholicism — yes, and even at Protestantism, in the desire to rebuild a *pure* Catholic worship.

"At its best" — yes, and, of course, there is the difficulty. It is not always at its best and it has certain grave dangers in it. Often enough there is a mere sterile copying of Roman practice on the part of the clergy and an absence of relation between worship and life, clergy and people. In the idea of frequent Communion, and of "hearing Mass", there is the danger of superstition and formality. The æsthetically satisfying worship *may* not be particularly religious. And high doctrine of the Ministry may readily produce spiritual pride. The whole thing may quite easily, as it were, "go sour" and lead to spiritual decay. Yet in comparing things you must do so *at the same level* : either take Catholicism at its best and compare it with Protestantism at its best, or else take both at their worst, or at their average. And our Protestant eyes are not entirely clear of motes — or even beams in these days.

I personally feel that even at its best the Catholic Revival denies authenticity to too much that is to me undeniably the voice of God and the Grace of God outside the prescribed channels, for it to be really true. Yet there is no doubt of its strength, nor of its creativity.

Within the Anglican Church it has created a terrific tension, which was seen perhaps at its height in the dispute over the 1928 Prayer Book. The causes of this are complex and the fault does not seem to me to lie entirely on any one side. The Catholic tends to insist on a doctrine of the Church and Sacraments, and especially perhaps of Orders, which is not the generally accepted view of the Church; and thus lays himself open to the charge of trying to fasten on the Church a restrictive and exclusive doctrine. The Evangelicals regard the movement with a suspicion not altogether free from bigotry. The Modernists, and noticeably the Bishop of Birmingham, roundly condemn it as mediæval superstition while the central *cadre* of the Church deplores the ecclesiastical politics into which the Church has been drawn. Violent reactions are to be expected in any passionate movement. The marvel is that the Church of England holds together under the strain, and there is something magnificent in a Church that can contain such fiercely contending and diverse elements.

What is its effect on the non-Anglican religious traditions, the so-called "Free Churches"? There is, of course, a great deal of purely negative reaction — "Why can't they go over to Rome and be done with it?" But there is much more of a positive and excellent nature. It is forcing the issue for us. Again and again one meets ordinary Church members who, through some friendship with Anglo-Catholics, have been forced to ask: "Why am I a Wesleyan, or a Presbyterian, or a Baptist? Why have I no such definite answer as these people have? What *do* I believe anyway?" This is especially true of the younger people, I think; and is often found directly connected with the Eucharist. That which we are apt to take all too lightly has been lit up once more for us by this rediscovery of the centrality of the Sacrament in another section of the Church of Christ. This has often



revealed a barrenness of the land which we must face. The old controversies, the old barriers, we find to be meaningless and perhaps the Catholic revival will bring to birth in our hearts a positive will to have done with them and close our ranks — not as a bulwark against Catholicism, but as at least one step towards a united Church. I believe it is teaching many people the value of ordered, dignified worship and the need for instruction in prayer. And if it leads us to a richer, deeper spiritual life, it will be great gain.

The essential marks of the Catholic spirit are not the prerogative of any one tradition : they are found in all denominations. They derive from a high doctrine of the nature of the Church. Under what has been termed the “ acids of modernity ” many easy conceptions are dissolving. The times in which we live are sifting us, forcing us to decide what we think of Christ, and what we believe to be the reality of the Church. The deep, main abiding reality of the Church lies, I believe, beneath and beyond Catholicism and Protestantism in their present forms. It is because contact with the Catholic revival in the Anglican Church has made some of us face these ultimate issues that we cannot but be grateful for that movement, even though the answer it gives to those issues cannot be ours. Let us then seek our unity again where it lies — in Christ, that the true Church may be born, One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic.

## **The Policy and Programme of the “ Kingdom of God ” Movement**

TOYOHICO KAGAWA

The Cross is the motive of the “ Kingdom of God ” Movement. The motive is that Christ died for us. We are unworthy of that precious fact. Pursued by that Love, we cannot but become heirs of Christ’s Blood and Death. This Cross is a stumbling block to Greeks, to Jews, to Japanese, to Americans,

to English people, but to us who belong to God it is the great revelation of Love.

Modern Churches, forgetting the Cross, are scattered and individualistic. The more they forget the Cross, the more God punishes them. In the Xth century, when Christianity forgot the Cross, it was scourged by Mohammedanism. And in the XIXth century, when it surrendered to capitalism, came the Marxian challenge. I thank God for this challenge of Marx. Marxism was the punitive admonition. If Christ's Cross had been thoroughly embraced by the Church, there would have been no chance for Marxism to appear.

Without the Cross principle, society cannot remain in permanent integration. I am convinced that the Cross is the fundamental truth of the organisation of society and of the social movement. For society cannot exist without love. Without conjugal love children cannot come into the world; without parental love the home does not become a permanent institution. Similarly, in the school, in the club, and in all social institutions love is the fundamental necessity.

A careful study of the life of Christ shows that He was misjudged to be a revolutionist. John 6:15 says the people wanted to take Christ and force Him to be King. He was, in other words, nominated by them to be a revolutionary leader. From that time onward, in order to teach them what are the essential values of society, Christ chose the Cross. The central fact of Christ's life is the Cross, and Christ Himself is the centre of the Kingdom of God Movement.

Unless Christ is made the centre of social and religious movements, neither Japan nor other countries will be saved. It was a great mistake that in the past the Church laid emphasis more on the individual experience of Christ than on making Christ manifest in society. The Sermon on the Mount gives a well-balanced picture of both sides, that Christianity is a Gospel for society as well as for the individual.

You know that there are so-called Christians everywhere who are not living clean enough as good citizens. Many of them are making compromises with existing economic conditions. They are not living up to the declaration Jesus

made at Nazareth. If they would live up to the true meaning of the Gospel, there would be no room left for communism.

Here is the danger of mysticism which is individualistic. Some mysticism is individualistic, some tends towards emotionalism, and some is inclined to be traditional. If we must have mysticism we should make it ethical mysticism. This was the distinction between the true and false prophets in Old Testament times. The individualistic, emotional and traditional prophets were considered to be false, while the ethical prophets were the genuine ones. In very modern times we have a corresponding illustration. The reason why the Greek Catholic Church is mocked at and religious values discredited in post-revolutionary Russia is because, prior to the revolution, the Russian State Church had been laying emphasis on individualistic experience rather than on social standards.

There are two kinds of individualism or of individuality. We are all familiar with the egoistic variety of individualism. But there is also the type connected with society, which may be called socialised individuality. This implies that the individual is included in society and that one fraction of his being is a consciousness of society. Unless such a consciousness of society is included in the individual consciousness, the personality has not yet attained completion. Christ laid emphasis on this socialised individuality as contrasted with egoism. But unfortunately after the Industrial Revolution individualistic competition outside the Church carried the whole culture toward egoistic individualism and secularism. If we could have managed the great Industrial Revolution according to Christian motivation this world-wide catastrophe would not have taken place. The reason why the Church lost the chance thus to organise the great Industrial Revolution was that it laid too much emphasis on doctrinal preaching. It would have been better if it had emphasised ethical mysticism and socialised individuality, social-ethical mysticism. Jesus Christ taught us that "The Kingdom of God is near; repent and believe in the Gospel!" To what kind of repentance did He summon us? He called us to repent from egoistic individualism; to repent to social-ethical mysticism,



the mysticism of the Epistle to the Ephesians.— So much for the philosophy of the Kingdom of God Movement.

### *The Education of Lay Leadership*

In the working programme of the movement, *education* plays a large part, the *education of lay leadership*. This is in accord with the sacred records. St. Paul went about the cities and towns of the Mediterranean area, carrying no pack nor baggage, and very much needing the hospitality and cooperation of lay workers. When he first attempted to go to Ephesus, he was deterred by the Holy Spirit, and so arrived instead at Corinth, where he found Priscilla and Aquila. At first neither knew the Gospel. But Paul, being of the same trade as theirs, won them to Christ through comradeship in manual labour. These tentmaking labourers had already received him into their home with warm hospitality, being themselves lonely Jews a long time away from Judea, and recently ejected from Rome by the Emperor (Acts 18:2-3).

When Paul finally did decide to start for Ephesus, Priscilla and Aquila said to him, "Teacher, we will go and make a home for you there also". So they got together their tools of trade and their family, boarded the same vessel with Paul, and moved to Ephesus. Paul left them there, and before his return to begin his apostolic work there, they opened their home and prepared the way, beginning the evangelism of Ephesus. In spite of the persecution which came later, they continued to serve Paul even at the cost of their lives, so that in Romans 16:4 Paul could say of them, "Who for my life laid down their own necks".

In spreading the Way of the Lord these humble people, a Christian layman and a lay-woman, took three methods : (1) they gave their lives for Christ; (2) they opened their home; (3) they sanctified their daily labour.

It is not hard to imagine that a large part of the cause for Paul's great success in his ' full three years ' in Ephesus was the hidden work of these lay people. The Kingdom of God Movement is not primarily a movement of paid pastors and evangelists. If the Early Church had depended on the

work of paid employees it would never have come into existence.

It is then, on the Biblical pattern that we are aiming, in the Kingdom of God Movement to train up five thousand lay workers. Today, February 11th, 1932, we are commencing the sixth annual session of the Japan Peasant Gospel School, at my home in Kawaragi near Osaka. The school lasts but one month — it is largely imitated from the Danish Folk High School system — but we want to have a longer session when it is possible to do so. Since the starting of this first school, dozens of others have sprung up in many parts of Japan, sponsored by pastors and missionaries of many denominations.

The aim of my school is cultural education and evangelism. We welcome only fifteen pupils at one time, but give this small number the very best of intensive training. We provide half of their board money. They pay the other half, and their travel expenses. The students live with me from the first to the last day, and we emphasise the value of what Luther called "table talks" at the common meals together.

We have four hours of lessons in the morning, taking Bible Study, Agricultural Science, Village Sociology, or how to reform the village from the Christian sociological viewpoint, and the History of the Christian Brotherhoods. This last is our name for Church History, which we do not teach from the point of view of doctrine and schism. We select from it only the stories of its love movements, such as those of St. Francis, of the Moravians, and of the *Gemeinschaft* of South Germany. I have translated into Japanese and published two books for this purpose, one of which is Stead's *Stories of Social Christianity*. The students are required not only to read these books, but to put them into practice, in their own village life. This is stronger than communism.

In the afternoon we give manual labour, such as carpentry, and other handicrafts, selecting those which develop the creative ability of the students and also help provide remunerative occupation for the many leisure days of the farmers, to eke out their very insufficient farm incomes.

In the evenings we have a variety of lessons and lectures which bear on the social problems of the villages.

The young people who come to these schools are mostly the elder sons of farmers, who are required by the Japanese social system to carry on the work of their fathers, and so cannot leave home, even if they could afford it, for long periods of higher education. They have all had the six to eight years of primary schooling, however, and have probably kept up their reading and widened their understanding to some extent in the few years which elapse before they are liable to come to the Gospel School.

We are considering having at least forty Gospel Schools of this kind in Japan, one for each of the provinces or prefectures.

We have a corresponding plan for the city manual labourers and other city people, but since they have no free days to correspond to the farm vacations, we plan for them a three-months' evening school, three nights a week, after their daily labour. A dozen years ago I started a Labour School in Osaka according to this schedule, teaching two hours each of three evenings per week, and continuing three months before the students could graduate. But what has been the result? Many of the proletarian candidates to the Japanese Diet have come from this school; and proletarian representatives to the Osaka City Assembly. I gave money out of my own pocket to start that school, and wanted to make it Christian; but the tide of the Labour Movement changed, and the school is not based on Christianity at all now. But through starting it I have realised how much such a Labour School might do for the Gospel, and I am hoping to utilise such schools, making them fortresses for Christian evangelism among the industrial and proletarian classes.

I am very glad to be able to report, therefore, that what we intend to make the typical Gospel School in Japan for city laymen and lay-women, was started in Tokyo on February 1st, 1932, with an enrollment of one hundred and sixty-eight pupils. We had intended to limit the enrollment to one hundred, but twice that number applied, and so we admitted as many as possible. The group is composed, roughly speaking, of about one-third of labourers, one-third of business and professional men, while students and those



out of employment compose each about one-half of the remainder. The curriculum includes eight hours each of Old and New Testament, the same of the Life of Christ, Theology, Church History, Methods of Evangelism, Sunday School Work, and the Relation between Science and Christianity, and four hours of Comparative Religions, History of the Christian Brotherhoods, Social Politics, History of Social Thought, History of Christian World Missions, Christian Literature, Practice of the Christian Social Movement, History of Christian Music and Christian Art.

In this group of students, nearly one-third are women; two-thirds are between the ages of twenty and thirty, and about the same proportion are graduates of professional schools, colleges and universities. Fourteen different Church denominations are represented, and thirteen come from Churches adhering to none of the recognised denominations. There is thus a great variety of points of view, but it is a joy to recognise the deep and living unity not only of the group of students, but of the pastors of many sects who attended the opening session on February 1st.

This unity of the pastors in supporting the school is a striking gain, a gradual development which has taken place during the first two years' experience of the Kingdom of God Movement. Although starting out with more unanimity than we have ever before experienced in our Christian Movement in Japan, this present campaign has undoubtedly deepened such unity of feeling on the part of the pastors, and paved the way for eventual organisation, out of all these distinct and sometimes conflicting denominations, of the United Church of Christ in Japan. I am most happy that at its last annual meeting, in December 1931, the Kingdom of God Movement Central Committee decided to continue indefinitely, beyond the first three-year period of action which was begun in 1930. Given such continuity of operation, the eventual unity of organism may be confidently hoped for. Such prolongation of the movement is absolutely necessary, moreover, to achieve its objectives.

In the first three years, 1930-1932, we are aiming at the organisation of three separate yet coordinating enterprises,

intending that each shall continue an indefinite number of years until its concrete numerical objective is attained, and perhaps even beyond that period :

(1) *Interdenominationally united evangelism*, which was organised in 1930 and has already produced the by-result noted above, of unity of feeling among the pastors. During this first year about ninety district committees of pastors were organised, practically covering the Empire : 248 cities were reached through 10,278 meetings, attended by approximately 262,344 people. These are the official statistics of the Kingdom of God Movement Central Committee. As to the number of definite decisions for Christ, the official statistics are smaller, but in my own personal records I find that in Aomori Province in November 1930 there were 1,523 cards signed in my meetings and in the previous month in Akita Province there were about 8,000, a good proportion of whom, however, must be counted as enquirers. Our eventual objective is one million new baptised Christians.

(2) In 1931 we have been trying to organise the *Gospel Schools* both in city and rural districts, for the training of lay preachers, and hope to go on and do so in other cities in Japan after the school in Tokyo has set the standard for the cities ; and in other rural districts as rapidly as possible. In this work our numerical objective is five thousand new trained lay preachers.

(3) In this year of 1932, while the interdenominational evangelism is going forward with increasing momentum, and the Gospel Schools are gathering more and more pupils who will soon be aiding in the evangelism we are making our new objective the organisation of *Christian Cooperatives*. Concerning this application of Christianity to economics there has been preliminary teaching in the Gospel Schools, and also committee work since 1930, aiming at its organisation on a nation-wide scale. It is the most difficult of the three objectives, being the most remote from the previous experience of the mainly bourgeois Church members. We are commencing, therefore, with a Physicians' Utility Cooperative for the city of Tokyo and its environs, sponsored by Dr. Inazo Nitobe as president, and a number of physicians, all specialists in their

own lines, who are sacrificing their private practices and will give their full time to its Cooperative Hospital. Already there is free medicine on a charity basis for the submerged poor, and the wealthy can afford to pay medical charges; but for the middle and labouring classes, more and more affected by economic depression and unemployment, there is no medical care within their reach. A single medical examination will cost a domestic servant her month's wages, and a few days in hospital equal the month's salary of a professional man. This Cooperative Hospital, therefore, in which after a nominal entrance fee all medical care is given at cost, will meet a great and crying need. Through membership in it I anticipate that large numbers of people will learn to appreciate the benefits of the cooperative system, and to extend their interest to other types of Cooperatives.

A related cooperative enterprise which I have started in connection with my own settlements in Tokyo, Osaka, and Kobe, and which we hope to start on a nation-wide scale with as far as possible all the 1,800 Churches in Japan as branches, is a Sick Insurance Cooperative. This will provide for its members the moderate sums required in the Physicians' Utility Cooperative, and the two will thus constitute a complete system for the cooperative protection of the health of the community.

Through these Cooperatives, the *Church members* will be educated in the Cooperative Movement in general, and will, I hope, learn to express the Love of Christ through sacrificial service in the many types of Cooperatives which are needed in Japan. At the same time (although this enterprise is not yet included under the officially recognised Kingdom of God Movement) I am trying to educate *students* also to leadership in the Cooperatives, through operating for them in five Tokyo Universities *Consumers' Cooperatives*. The first was organised in Waseda University on May 15, 1926; another followed in Takushoku University in 1927; Imperial University organised in 1928 and St. Paul's and Meiji Universities in 1929. There is a Federation called the *Tokyo Student Consumers' Union*, which has maintained its continued existence during a most trying period when communists were



penetrating most other student organisations and inevitably causing their suppression by the police. This year, at the January 1932 Annual Meeting, the police did indeed attempt to suppress it on a technicality, and the assembly had to be postponed while I visited police headquarters and warned the authorities of the short-sightedness of such a policy. They permitted the students to reassemble a few days later and to conclude their meeting peacefully.

Japan has a good beginning of the system of Cooperatives, in the Credit Unions, and Purchasing, Selling, and Utilisation Cooperative Societies, of which in 1930 there were more than fourteen thousand among the Japanese farmers. Since, however, these rural Cooperative Societies are liable at present to serve the more prosperous farmers rather than the poor ones, and to omit working for social reconstruction, I am endeavouring to train up large numbers of Christian leaders to go into them and fill them with the sacrificial spirit of the Love of Christ.

There is a similar need for Christian leadership in the *Consumers' Cooperatives* among city labourers and professional people, of which there is a promising development, and about one hundred and fifty stores by latest reports. The misappropriation of money by their cashiers is a common misfortune of such societies, however, and another is their tendency at present to be captured by Marxians. In our own Cooperative Stores we make the rule, therefore, that only baptised Christians shall be put into positions of responsibility and we are at work to train such workers in large numbers, so that the Cooperative Movement all over the country may be stabilised by Christian character and vitalised by the Christian vision of a world of Love and Brotherhood. Thus we hope for the needed social reconstruction by the gradual and peaceful development of Christian Cooperatives, and to organise methods for the training of their Christian leaders as much as possible through the 1932 programme of the Kingdom of God Movement.

After the great Industrial Revolution, Christianity was not realised in economic enterprise. As an individual the Christian was a fine gentleman, but when he entered the

industrial circle he did not know what he was doing. Therefore it remains for us of today to find out that Christianity and the science of economics do not contradict each other. When we apply the Love of Christ to social problems, we can get the best solution for them, better than communism, than anarchism, than any other attempt at their solution.

The communists think that social science and Christianity contradict each other; such errors have occurred before. When Galileo was put in prison and tortured in the XVIth century, it was believed that Christianity was opposed to natural science. When Darwin tried to explain natural history by the theory of evolution, again many Christians believed it contradicted the truth of Christ. But when I studied science, the more I studied biology, the more I had faith in Christ. The science of evolution is nothing but the development of morphology or changes of types of animals and plants, through which God's power is manifested. So with social science. The Love of Christ must be expressed through economics.

We must have a Love Movement, or economic cooperation. The coldness we find at present in the Churches is because we are separated from one another. If the spirit of cooperation flames up in the Church, and comrades come together and start Cooperatives, the coldness will disappear and Pentecost come again.

Priscilla and Aquila first gave their lives, secondly opened their home and thirdly sanctified their daily labour. In the Kingdom of God Movement we are trying to follow them, first by offering our very lives for Christ, for this is a life and death battle. Secondly we are trying to open our homes. Married couples do not go alone. The wife goes with her husband. There are individualistic types of religion, where the men retire to mountain monasteries and the women to nunneries. But we must make the offering of our homes with equal devotion. Priscilla and Aquila probably had children, but nevertheless they opened their home. By renting a twenty-yen-a-month house instead of a fifteen-yen one, you can have an extra room, an evangelistic meeting. That is a *Church-in-the-House*, like those of early Christianity.

Thirdly we are trying also to sanctify our daily labour. If we think it enough to pay a salary to pastors and evangelists and let them do the work, Japan will never be won. We ourselves must do the work. That means that we must make an offering of our occupations. We must be willing to forego reaping the full fruits of our labours, to go, as did Priscilla and Aquila, from city to city and from village to village, supporting ourselves by our own labour while carrying the Gospel Message. If we can do this, the victory is near in Japan.

## Ueber die Kirche

L. A. ZANDER

*„Die Fülle des, der alles  
in allen erfüllet.“*

Epheser 1,23

Das Unglück unserer Zeit besteht darin, dass uns der Sinn der Kirche verloren gegangen ist. Das Wort ist geblieben, aber es ist kraftlos, arm und leergeworden. An was denken wir, wenn wir dieses heilige Wort „Kirche“ sagen und hören? Immer an vergängliche, zeitliche und sekundäre Dinge. Nie an das Ursprüngliche, Ewige, Absolute.

Manche von uns verstehen unter Kirche eine gewisse soziale Organisation — das äussere Skelett der christlichen Gesellschaft; andere — den Klerus, die Geistlichkeit — die offiziellen Vertreter dieser Gesellschaft; wieder andere — das materielle Substrat des kultischen Lebens: Tempel und Altäre, Zeremonien und Traditionen. Aber selten denken wir an die Kirche, als an die einzige und absolute Macht auf Erden, als an die Erlöserin und Helferin, als an unser himmlisches Heim — in dessen Räumen alle Christen aller Zeiten eins sind und einstimmig den Herrn preisen.

Die *una sancta oecumenica et apostolica* ist uns beinahe ganz unbekannt geworden: wir begegnen ihr nur in Lehr-



büchern, Katechismen und theologischen Dissertationen; nie — in den Tiefen unseres Gewissens, in unserer religiösen Erfahrung. Dies gilt von der ganzen christlichen Welt, denn die Säkularisierung ist eine Krankheit, an der alle — bewusst oder unbewusst — leiden. Einige lösen den Begriff der Kirche in der Mannigfaltigkeit der moralisch-sozialen Funktionen auf; andere zerstückeln ihn in der Buntheit nationaler Gruppen; wieder andere gehen blind vorwärts, ohne zu sehen, dass es auch andere Wege gibt und dass ein Teil sich niemals für das Ganze halten darf.

Und dies ist tragisch, denn die Kirche ist der einzige Weg zu Gott. Ohne sie ist weder Leben, noch Freude, noch Erlösung möglich. „Wem die Kirche nicht Mutter ist, dem ist Gott nicht Vater“, lautet ein alter Spruch des Cyprian von Karthago.

Was ist nun die Kirche? Wo ist sie zu suchen? Wie ist sie zu erkennen?

Es wäre töricht, die Kirche zu definieren, oder zu versuchen, sie zu beschreiben. Denn die Kirche ist die Fülle (nach Paulus) und von der Fülle ist jede Behauptung zugleich wahr und falsch. Wahr — darum weil die Fülle *alles* in sich enthält; falsch — darum weil *nichts* in der Fülle für das Ganze angenommen werden darf. Jedes Bild von der Kirche ist nur ein Schatten. Die Kirche ist aber Leben, das nie in Worten oder Formeln ausgedrückt werden kann. Nur in der Erfahrung Ihrer Erfüllung kann man ihr begegnen, kann sie gekannt und verstanden werden. Leben — Erleben — nicht Denken ist sie für die Menschen. Infolgedessen wollen die folgenden Zeilen keinen Anspruch darauf erheben, eine Idee der Kirche zu geben oder einen Begriff darzustellen. Sie wollen vielmehr die Richtung der gemeinsamen Anstrengungen aufweisen, die uns zu einer Renaissance des Kirchengefühls und Kirchenlebens leiten kann.

Die Kirche ist ein lebendiges Wesen — dies ist der erste Satz, den wir im Auge halten müssen, wenn wir wahrhaftig an eine lebendige und einige Kirche glauben. Sie ist keine Person — im menschlichen Sinn des Wortes, aber sie ist mit allen Eigenschaften, die ein menschliches Wesen charakteri-

sieren, ausgestattet. Sie hat ihre Weisheit, deren Verkünder die Apostel, Kirchenväter und andere gottbegnadigte Männer sind. Diese Weisheit ist durch menschliche Worte ausgedrückt und erklärt, aber nie kann die kirchliche Wahrheit mit dem menschlichen Denken adäquat sein, denn die Worte der Menschen sind tote Zeichen für starre Begriffe, und die Weisheit der Kirche ist Leben und Macht — ein Quickborn, der sich ewig erneuert und sich nie erschöpft.

Die Kirche hat auch ihren Willen, den wir aus der Stimme der Geschichte kennen lernen. Dieser Wille fällt nicht mit den Beschlüssen der Kirchenbehörde zusammen. Priester und Patriarchen sind Menschen und können sich irren, ganze Konzilien können irregehen, aber immer lässt sich der Wille der Kirche erkennen — und wenn er nur von einer Minorität, ja sogar einem Gläubigen dargestellt wird.<sup>1</sup>

Und endlich — die Schönheit; denn neben den ästhetischen Künsten, die uns die Herrlichkeit der von Gott geschaffenen Natur offenbaren, ist noch etwas anderes da, eine andere Kunst, eine andere Schönheit, die wir als Erscheinung des Heiligen Geistes empfinden. Diese kirchliche Aesthetik ist weder subjektiv, noch menschlich, obgleich sie sich irdischer und menschlicher Mittel bedient, um zur Erscheinung zu kommen. Sie ist von Niemandem erdacht worden, denn nur ein allgemeiner Glaube — und gemeinsames Gefühl können sie zustande bringen.

In allen diesen ihren Eigenschaften ist die Kirche ein metaphysisches und metahistorisches Subjekt, neben dem nichts als selbständig und ganz betrachtet werden darf: Kultur, Nationen, einzelne Menschen können nur als ihr Teil angenommen werden. Besser gesagt, nicht als Teile (denn die Kirche ist unteilbar), sondern als Glieder, Glieder eines lebendigen Organismus, von denen jedes potenziell das Ganze in sich enthält und es aktuell vertritt. Die Vielheit dieser Glieder wird der Kirche von der Erde, von der materiellen Welt zugeteilt: das ist die Geschichte und die Natur. Aber das, was diese Mannigfaltigkeit und Vielheit zu einer

---

<sup>1</sup> Die schwierige Frage, wie man die wahre Stimme der Kirche von allen anderen unterscheiden kann, kann hier nicht erörtert werden.

Einheit macht, das ist der Wille Gottes, der uns alle in Seiner Liebe hält ; das ist der Heilige Geist, der alle Kirchenelemente durchweht und belebt ; das ist das allerheiligste Blut Christi, das in den Adern der Kirche zirkuliert. Von den Gläubigen wird es in dem Sakrament der Eucharistie eingenommen, es durchdringt ihren Leib, es heiligt ihre Gefühle und macht sie wahrhaftig, im strengsten Sinne dieses Wortes, zu Gliedern des Körpers Christi. Denn der Mensch mit allen seinen Gaben und Eigenschaften, mit seinem Wollen und Denken und Fühlen ist nur Materie, „ chemisches Substrat „, das durch das lebendige warme Blut beseelt, durch den Hauch Gottes belebt und in den heiligen Weltorganismus der Kirche eingeschaltet wird.

Das Primat der Kirche ist infolgedessen der Urgrundstein unserer Welt- und Lebensanschauung. Nur sie, die Kirche, hat wahre Existenz, eigene Geschichte und Schicksal. Nur sie ist absolut, ewig und allumfassend. Und wir alle haben einen Wert und einen Sinn, insofern wir der Kirche angehören, ihre Vertreter, Erfüller, Verkörperung sind. Denn sie ist die Braut des Lammes, Königin der Erde und des Himmels, der einzige Schatz alles Guten.

Dies bedeutet in keinem Fall eine Entpersonalisierung oder Kollektivierung ; im Gegenteil ! Um eine Aufgabe der Kirche zu erfüllen, bedarf ich aller meiner geistigen und körperlichen Kraft, aller meiner persönlichen Gaben, die bis zum äussersten gesteigert sein müssen und nur in dieser kultivierten Form würdig sind, der Kirche zu dienen. Damit ist unsere Lebensaufgabe als der einer „ Verkirchlichung „ gedeutet. Alles muss in die Kirche eingegliedert werden und dieser Prozess hat keine Grenzen noch Schranken, denn alles Sichtbare und Unsichtbare, alle Kultur und alle Natur, Geist und Körper, Tatsache und Geschehen kann und muss zur Kirche werden.

Wie ist dies nun möglich ? Wie kann die beschränkte und sündige Natur zum Körper Gottes werden, sich vergöttlichen ? Jeder Christ wird im Namen des Vaters, Sohnes und Heiligen Geistes getauft. Von Geburt an wird er der Heiligen Dreieinigkeit dargebracht, und dieser Name ist das Siegel Gottes auf sein ganzes Leben : durch ihn wird uns



auch das Mysterium der Kirche offenbar, in ihm finden wir die Lösung des Lebensproblems. Denn hier, in der allerheiligsten Dreieinigkeit werden alle Schranken überwunden, jede Selbstbejahung zum Opfer gemacht. Die drei Personen Gottes wurden — ohne ihre Persönlichkeit zu verlieren — eins, und sind eins. Durch die Liebe geschieht es, denn Gott ist Liebe und Liebe ist Einigkeit der Mannigfaltigkeit : „Dreifaltigkeit — Einigkeit, erbarme Dich unser!“<sup>1</sup> Für uns ist diese Einigkeit Gebot und Norm, Kreuz und Opfer; aber für Gott ist sie höchste Realität, natürliche Essenz Seines Lebens.

Dieses Mysterium als höchste *Tatsache* anzunehmen, es zu fühlen, zu entdecken und im eigenen Leben nachzuahmen, das heisst an Gott glauben und in der Kirche leben. „Auf dass sie alle eines seien, gleichwie Du Vater in mir und ich in Dir.“ „Daran wird jedermann erkennen, dass ihr meine Jünger seid, so ihr Liebe untereinander habt.“ Joh. 17,21 und 13, 53. Lieben aber heisst : „alles meine ist in dir; ich hebe mich für dich auf.“ Und diese Liebe ist überall dieselbe : sie bindet die allerheiligsten Personen Gottes, sie waltet über die Welt, sie vereint uns mit dem Himmel und bringt uns zu einem göttlichen Organismus zusammen. Die Liebe dürfen wir nicht nur im Werden — als ein Befolgen der Gebote Gottes, sondern auch im Sein — als Erfüllung der Gnade und Tatsache der Heiligkeit betrachten. Und dieser Organismus der Liebe, diese Liebe Gottes und der Menschen, die sich zu einem lebendigen Wesen organisiert, ist die Kirche. Sie ist eins und einzig. Wenn man von der unsichtbaren und sichtbaren, von der triumphierenden und kämpfenden, von der ewigen und historischen Kirche spricht, sind das nur verschiedene Glieder, verschiedene Aspekte derselben einzigen, heiligen, allesumfassenden Kirche Christi. Sie darf mit keinem uns bekannten Gebilde identifiziert werden, denn sie ist metaphysisch und metahistorisch. Aber sie ist auch in der Zeit und im Raum, insofern sie sich hier auf der Erde verkörpert und sich in Menschen und Dingen offenbart. Der Mittelpunkt dieser Offenbarung ist die Erscheinung Christi auf

---

<sup>1</sup> Aus dem grossen Kanon des Andreas von Kreta.

Erden. „Gott ist Fleisch geworden“. Dadurch ist allem Fleisch, der ganzen materiellen Welt eine Vergöttlichung möglich gemacht; nach der Verkörperung Christi kann alles in das göttliche Leben hineingezogen werden, heilig sein. Alles, was vor diesem Moment geschah, war nur ein Vorbild, alles, was nachher zustande kam — nur ein Nachbild Christi. Das Nachbild ist aber nicht nur eine Nachahmung, eine Allegorie, sondern trägt in sich reell das Bild, gehört zu seiner Natur, enthält in sich die Essenz des Bildes. Insofern aber etwas nicht Nachbild Christi ist und keine Liebe — diese Essenz des göttlichen Lebens — in sich trägt und hegt, insofern es nicht Kirche ist, existiert es nur scheinbar, zeitlich, zufällig und hat nichts in sich, was es mit der Ewigkeit verbinden könnte.

Die Kirche ist Leben, und zwar ein zweiseitiges; es lebt die Liebe Gottes zu seinem Geschöpfe; und es lebt die entgegenkommende Liebe der ganzen Natur zu Gott. Das Niederkommen Gottes auf die Erde ist nicht nur eine Tatsache der historischen Inkarnation, sondern ein ewiges Geschehen der göttlichen Gnade: Gott ermüdet sich nicht, zu uns niederzusteigen. Er antwortet uns in den Dialogen unserer Gebete; Er spricht zu uns in den ewigen Worten der Schrift; unerlässlich schafft Er neue Wunder, die nur der modernen Blindheit unbemerkt bleiben. Den vollkommensten Sitz Seiner Gnade und Liebe bildet doch das Sakrament, wo Er selbst persönlich anwesend ist, uns in Zions Kammer einführt, uns mit Seinem Leibe und Blute nährt und dann in das Leben führt, um mit den Aposteln den Heiligen Geist zu empfangen und mit ihnen zusammen an der Verkörperung des Reiches Gottes und der Erfüllung der Kirche zu arbeiten. Diesem göttlichen Niedersteigen entspricht ein Aufsteigen der ganzen Natur, die insgesamt als ein Paradies geschaffen wurde und wieder zu ihrer ursprünglichen Schönheit durch den Prozess der Verklärung und Transfiguration strebt. Hier findet das menschliche Schaffen und Wirken seinen Raum, hier ist das Band zwischen unserer irdischen Arbeit und ihrem himmlischen Sinn. Die Domäne der Kirche beschränkt sich aber nicht auf die Menschenkinder: Tiere und Pflanzen, Vögel und Felder, Wasser und Luft, alles dies

wird gesegnet, gereinigt, geheiligt; alles dies preist, singt, lobt Gott, durch Arbeit und Taten, durch Laute und Töne, durch die stille Schönheit, in der das gläubige Auge die Erscheinung des Geistes sieht. „Alles Lebende lobt den Herrn“, dies ist die kosmische Wahrheit, in der die Liebe und Einheit nicht nur als Norm des Menschenlebens, sondern auch als Weltgesetz und Lebensessenz betrachtet wird: und dies ist die Kirche.

## **The Church and the Student Movement in Sweden**

Arnold WERNER

The beginning of this century was for the Swedish Church a time of hardship. All contemporary thought seemed to oppose the Church. The optimistic believers in evolution considered her rather obsolete. The positivism of natural science regarded her with supercilious criticism. The growing labour movement took a more and more hostile attitude. The Free Church Movement considered her spiritually inferior. Harassed on all sides her ministers became discouraged, and the theological students at the universities were often regarded by their fellow-students as rather inferior beings. Furthermore, Swedish theological thought was still to a large extent dominated by the ecclesiastical orthodoxy of the XIXth century, although growing signs of a new orientation were not completely lacking.

The Swedish student movement did not yet exist as a unified national body. The Christian student groups, existing since the middle of the XIXth century in our universities at Upsala and Lund and later also in Stockholm, were on the whole permeated by a pietistic non-confessional attitude which as far as possible kept aloof from the National Church. The only connecting link at that time between the Christian



students of Swedish universities were the big Scandinavian student conferences with a Christian programme. The third conference was that at Vadstena in 1895, when the World's Student Christian Federation was formed.

This in rough outline was the general situation until 1905 ; but with the dissolution of the union between the kingdoms of Sweden and Norway in 1905 there began a new period in the history of organised Christianity among Swedish students. The Scandinavian conferences came to an end and were not resumed until after the war, in 1919. In place of these an independent Swedish Christian Student Movement grew up with its own organisation and national conferences. The student movement in Sweden acquired a clearly national character.

In the following years 1907-1911, the new current in religious thinking set in which brought the Student Christian Movement into a definite and positive relationship to the Church of Sweden. What happened can be expressed shortly with these words : the Church and its prospective God-given possibilities were being discovered. Important dates in this development were the student conferences at Huskvarna 1907 and 1909. At the former conference Dr. J. A. Eklund, Bishop of Karlstad, was asked to speak, which he did on the condition that he should be permitted to choose the subject : " Youth and our Swedish Evangelical Church ", a subject which at that time was not at all desired. This address and the address given by Dr. E. Billing, now Bishop of Västerås, on " The Atonement " were both of momentous importance for that turn of the tide towards the Church which now began especially in the Christian Student Association of Upsala.

In 1908 Nathan Söderblom published his first book on the Church, *The Church of Sweden*, a book which Dr. Billing has characterised as " Reden über die Kirche an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern ". Söderblom finishes this book with the prophetic words : " Is it my faith which causes hallucinations ? No, what I hear is no illusion. From different sides I hear sounds which indicate that the bells will once more call to divine service in the Church of Sweden."

Söderblom was right. A new time for the Swedish Church was in the making, and one of its greatest promoters was Söderblom himself. At the Huskvarna conference in 1909 he spoke on the subject : " The Individual and the Church."

This new enthusiastic belief in the Church spread more and more among the university students of Upsala. The main student leader for this was Manfred Björkquist. He too began preaching a new vision of the Church, first of all in his pamphlet : *The Conception of the Church*. Under his guidance the so-called crusades were started. The first one took place in the summer of 1909, when 56 Upsala undergraduates, preaching and distributing popular tracts, visited some 245 parishes, with the purpose of stirring up a new sense of responsibility for the Church of Sweden and for the Christian faith. In groups of two they set out on their crusade and directed their attention first of all to youth. They also tried to get in touch with the workers and had often lively debates with them in the trade unions. The following summer the crusaders amounted to 80, of which some came from Lund. This time some 600 parishes were visited.

In 1909 Sweden had a general strike. An episode from that time may be told here : " Every afternoon the trade union of Upsala arranged lectures at its headquarters. Some members of the Christian Student Association asked for and received permission to arrange one of those lectures on the condition 'that it must be on a scientific subject', which they promised. Professor Söderblom was immediately willing to undertake the task. 'I will speak about the Church. But we must have some very learned title. Let us say : " The Church in the Light of the History of Religion " '. At the appointed hour the yard of the trade union house was filled with workers. But suddenly it started to rain. Professor Söderblom then announced that the only locality sufficiently large he had at his disposition was the Holy Trinity Church, and as the listeners were willing to follow him, Söderblom marched off from the trade union house to the church, leading the way for the whole crowd of striking workers. The church was filled up, and then Söderblom spoke for nearly two hours

on "The Church of Sweden" in such an inspiring way that nobody present ever will forget it." This episode is somewhat symbolic.

This new vision of the Church, first discovered by Upsala undergraduates, but also meeting with eager response at Lund and Stockholm, led to various new religious activities. In those three Christian Student Associations "Voluntary Church Corps" were founded, instruments for the voluntary Church work of the undergraduates. Through them the crusades were organised. Through them Church gatherings for youth were arranged in various parts of the country. And religious and social questions relating to the Church were studied in lectures and discussions.

Within the Church there grew up a new confidence. New methods of work were adopted, sometimes through direct influence from the student movement.

In 1910 the Voluntary Church Corps of Upsala published the first number of *Our Parole*, a monthly paper embodying the ideas and intentions of the new movement. It is used today as the national organ of the Swedish Christian Student Movement as a whole.

In the same year Manfred Björkquist founded a people's high-school on Church basis, which has since been continued under the name: "Sigtuna Foundation". This imposing block of buildings in cloister style is situated in a small town rich in historical traditions, at one hour's journey from Stockholm. Besides serving for educational purposes it stimulates various Church activities of younger date and its hospice is a much loved resort for student conferences as well as many other kinds of gatherings.

All this new interest in university circles for the Church and its tasks in the nation was one of the strongest incentives of that Church Renaissance which began in Sweden some years before the War and which developed increasingly under Nathan Söderblom's archiepiscopacy. No individual man has been of more importance for this development than he. His influence has immensely contributed to give cultivated public opinion a fresh understanding of the values of the Church.

What was really this new vision of the Church which emerged there at Upsala about 1909 ? In the first place it meant a clearly positive attitude towards the Church instead of the prevailing evasive or negative one. This did not imply, however, that everything was accepted as it was without criticism. But the criticism made was a criticism of love which intended to further a renewal of the Church.

For a new love of the Church had actually grown up. The Church of Sweden was regarded as an instrument given by God in history for the propagation of the Gospel in national life. The exterior, ecclesiastical organisation itself embracing the whole nation with its geographically fixed parish limits got a new deep spiritual meaning. The Church was an embodiment of God's preventing grace which seeks everyone without respect to person. The very conception of a national Church meant the disregarding of all subjective qualifications. It was "the Church of the open door", a Church which had been entrusted with the supreme task to preach the word of God to the just and unjust, to the high and low, to the poor and rich. It was called by God to be His servant in every realm of national life. The watchword of the new movement was therefore "The people of Sweden — a people of God". "For — as Björkquist expressed it — when God thought His great thoughts, thought men, peoples and universes, He thought also the people of Sweden." And Billing added later : "Therefore it has (as every people) this one duty : to strive for a clearer understanding of itself as being a thought of God, and to bring this thought into fuller realisation in its own life." The instrument for this is the Church.

Only a few hints have been given here of this new conception of the Church. It can only be fully understood when seen on the background of the comparatively homogenous religious and ecclesiastical conditions in Sweden. Probably no people is as a whole so purely Evangelic Lutheran as the people of the great Gustaf Adolf. And since the Reformation the Church in Sweden through its close connection with the State has always in various ways been intimately associated with national life and education.



Coinciding with the Church Renaissance, a new theology gained ground at our universities. Although having received many valuable impulses from abroad, it has a markedly independent Swedish character. In many respects it has anticipated the best intentions of the now so modern Barthian theology without falling into its exaggerations. This applies especially to E. Billing's theological thinking.

This theology together with the new interpretation of the Church, exercised a decisive influence on the whole Christian Student Movement. This fact explains why the movement has always avoided a subjective personal basis, and instead has always stood for a "declaration of purpose" which was dictated by the same objective view on Christian educational work as prevailed on the Church.

The marked tendency within the Swedish Christian Student Movement towards the Swedish National Church, however, led to a schism with the Free Church students who left the movement in 1912, and formed a Christian Student Movement of their own, founded on a personal basis in full accordance with the congregational principle of the Free Churches, for which the personal conversion is the constituent element. Through the agreement reached at the General Committee meeting of the World's Student Christian Federation at Nyborg Strand in 1926 a certain degree of reunion has taken place between the two Swedish movements.

When John Mott visited Upsala in 1909, he said: "Here the university has not been lost in a large city, but it can live a concentrated life, here is the centre of the Swedish Church. From here a powerful spiritual movement could certainly emerge."

Mott was right, as the happenings of the following years have shown, especially when one considers the well-known œcumenical rôle which Upsala later on played through Nathan Söderblom's life-work in service for the Universal Church.

This œcumenical work has won a wide response in the Christian student world in Sweden, among the National Church as well as the Free Church students. This œcumenical spirit has more and more permeated the mutual relationships

of the two student movements, and brought them much closer together. The spiritual home is as before either the National Church or the Free Churches, but this fact does not exclude a friendly cooperation on various points between the two groups. Both denominational homelessness and intolerance are rejected.

This internationally minded œcumenical tendency is, however, mainly supported by a new generation within the Swedish Student Movement, which is younger than the generation which witnessed the turning towards the Church before the War. The earlier generation had extraordinarily strong national interests. Owing to this narrowness of outlook it has never been able to embrace the œcumenical Church internationalism with the same intensity as its interests in the National Church. The œcumenical vision has rather been a burning interest to some post-war leaders of the student movement, especially those of us who were more or less directly engaged in Söderblom's work for Christian unity. But on the whole we live in another epoch now than before the War. The continually increasing interdependence of peoples and continents calls upon the national Churches as well as on the Universal Church of Christ to unite in carrying out their work of spiritual edification in a world which but for the Gospel would more and more fall into discord, strife and decay.

## THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

### Chinese Students in the Far Eastern Crisis

The following extracts from letters sent to the Federation by Mr. Y. T. Wu of the Student Division of the Y. M. C. A. in China will help our readers to understand better what has recently happened among Chinese students. The first letter was written before the situation of Shanghai had developed into "a war, in every respect except in name". The second letter speaks of the situation as it was at the end of the first week of fighting around Shanghai.

It was at Peking that the General Committee of the World's Student Christian Federation resolved to fight war and all causes leading to war. Little did its members think that the next war would be fought so soon and in that very part of the world.

The Far Eastern crisis may affect us in one of two ways. It may make us cynical about all efforts to fight war. Or it may strengthen our determination to do our utmost to prevent its recurrence. Our colleagues in the Far East will not have suffered in vain if we choose the second alternative.

#### I

*December 16th, 1931*

"These are days of tension and excitement, of hopes and fears, and often of bewilderment as to what one should think, believe or stand for. Every morning one eagerly peruses the daily paper. Headlines in bold types, extras, hand-bills, posters, are now familiar things to be seen in out-of-the-way alleys as well as in the main streets. Private conversation, public discussion, publications of all kinds deal with no other subject than the one which now monopolises national attention.

Let me now turn to the situation that obtains among students since September 18. Even now when the whole scene is still going on, it is not too much to say that we are witnessing a student patriotic movement on a much more gigantic scale than even that of the May 4, 1919 or the May 30, 1926. It is true that a great national calamity is upon us, but the vigour that the students display this time surpasses our expectation.

Beginning from September 25, when 51 students representing 25 colleges went to Nanking to see the President and petition for an immediate mobilisation of the national force against Japan, the past three months witness an incessant stream of students pouring into and storming the capital. Besides those from Shanghai, a large number came all the way from Peiping, Tientsin, Tsinan, Wuchang, Hankow, Foochow and Amoy. This includes a good percentage of girl students. These trips were in most cases accompanied by a good deal of hardship. The most dramatic instance was that of November 24, when 6,500 students in Shanghai, after a monster parade joined by other students, commandeered cars of the Shanghai-Nanking Railway and left for Nanking in five instalments to petition the Government. At first, the railway authorities, fearing trouble, refused passage, but the students, all determined to carry out their project, lay down on the tracks in front of the engine and succeeded in stopping all traffic until the authorities finally gave out. They had to stand in front of the National Government's building for two days and one night before the President could see them. The weather suddenly changed and the students were caught unprepared. Quivering in the cold and in the rain and with only a scanty ration provided for them, they persisted in their efforts and succeeded in securing from the President a written statement to the effect, that the Government would accept the various proposals of the students, which include mobilisation at the earliest date. Over two hundred students came back from the trip ill. One student told me that the enterprise meant five nights without any regular sleep to the whole group.

It is estimated that in all there must have been at least 50,000 students who have gone to Nanking during the past three months from different parts of China. The main points in their petitions to the Government may be summarised as follows :

1. Declaration of war with Japan and recovery of lost territory at the earliest possible moment.
2. Opposition to direct negotiation with Japan before withdrawal of Japanese troops.
3. Opposition to the establishment of a neutral zone in Chinchow and the rumoured "international control" of Tientsin.
4. Dismissal and punishment of officials such as Chang Hsueh-liang and Wellington Koo who are accused of following a "weak-knee" policy.
5. Immediate unification of the country by the getting together of Nanking and Canton.
6. Non-interference with the students' and people's movements in the interests of the present crisis.



It is inevitable with such big movements of students that there should be some excesses. Dr. C. T. Wang, the ex-Foreign Minister, was the first unfortunate victim when the Foreign Office was attacked in one of the earlier demonstrations and when Wang himself was badly injured. In several cases station-masters were beaten, passengers dispersed and other means of violence resorted to. The Mayor of Shanghai was made a virtual prisoner by the students for a full day and night when two students were kidnapped by a gang in the midst of a meeting. On the day President Chiang tendered his resignation several hundred students attacked two high officials in the Party Headquarters. The communists of course made full use of their opportunities. In various parades and demonstrations which resulted in disturbances, they made no attempt to cover up the sinister twist which they are trying to give to the patriotic movement. Red banners, red arm-bands and "reactionary" slogans were openly used in some instances.

On the whole, however, the students display excellent order and discipline. The few cases of riotous outbreaks cannot be compared with the careful organisation and excellent spirit that prevail throughout these months. At the same time the Government has been extremely cautious in dealing with the students. Except in one or two acute cases, they are treated with great courtesy.

In the numerous forms of student activities in relation to the Manchuria affair, one note rings more clearly than all the rest. As I have already mentioned, the students want to recover lost territory by armed force. That China is in no condition to go to war with Japan does not seem to bother them at all. They went as far as dictating the date on which President Chiang must start for his northern expedition. Six days after the Mukden incident, four brothers, students of universities in Shanghai, sold all their clothes and other belongings for the benefit of the flood sufferers and volunteered for military service. On September 27, a union of students' military training corps was formed in Shanghai, numbering 8,000 members. At the time of writing there is regular military training every morning in nearly all the schools. Three hundred young men volunteer to go up to fight in Heilungkiang where the lone army of General Ma Chan Shan was holding out against the Japanese forces, and where the weather was many degrees below zero. For several days the whole student body of Shanghai had "tag days" to raise money for General Ma. Many universities now become military camps. Martial law is declared by the students, the university gates are guarded by student gendarmes, and no one is admitted without a pass. When

one visits one of these universities, one almost suspects that China has already declared war with Japan.

I will say a few words about the attitude of the Christian students. On the whole not many of them take any attitude that would be distinctly different from that of the non-Christian students. However, they are not so outspoken as the latter in advocating war.

One of the most influential student Christian unions said in a statement : " We stand for non-violent opposition for two reasons : first, we are not in a position to use force now, because we are not prepared ; second, we should not use force because, seeing we are unprepared, we must look for help from the League of Nations, and armed resistance would make the case more difficult for the League to handle." In the opinion of most Christian students, a righteous war in defence of one's nation is not violating the law of love nor contradicting the Christian spirit. We do have a handful of students, however, who stand boldly for the *pacifist* position and denounce any kind of violence. There are others who find themselves in a dilemma : they do not believe that war is right according to the teachings of Christ and yet they see no better way for nations to settle disputes than going to war. A few days ago I had a heated debate with a small group of students of varying shades of beliefs from the extreme pacifist to the mild militarist. The debate lasted for two hours with unusual keenness. There was no unanimous agreement on the pacifist position, but that they do not take the opposite position for granted and are open to the possibility of an alternative is significant.

Practically all the schools have now gone on strike. Besides demonstrations the students have organised themselves for different kinds of activities such as publicity, lecturing to the people, study and discussion of the Manchurian problem. In many cases they have taken the law into their own hands. Several Presidents find it difficult to reconcile themselves to this abnormal state of affairs and offer their resignations. With the present political change, however, it is hoped that this youthful uprising will subside and turn itself into more constructive channels.

Let me now close with a brief estimate of these recent events. The present student movement has brought forth violent reactions of different kinds. Some feel that it is a sheer waste of time for students to meddle in something which even experts find too difficult to deal with. Their proper duty is to remain in their schools to study. They not only waste their own time, but also that of the officials who have to face several delegations of students a day. Besides, their lawlessness is most deplorable. Others take a most sympathetic attitude. If China were normal and had a good Government, students

would not have taken matters into their own hands. How much more gloomy the present situation would be if we did not have this uproarious indignation of students against Japan. Besides, the present movement is not new ; Chinese students have interfered with politics for centuries.

Between these two extreme attitudes we can find the golden mean for ourselves. Personally I rejoice to see the students act in the way they have acted. In an article dealing with student movements written last year, I pointed out a most potent factor in student life in the consciousness of a need for fundamental social reconstruction. Then, the students were quiescent because of Government suppression. They have now found a cause to put their efforts into for the time being, and they show us clearly that they are still full of vitality and vigour. Social changes of a more fundamental character will be coming to this part of the world sooner or later and we have every reason to believe that in this, as in previous important changes, the students will once more be in the front line."

## II

*February 5, 1932*

" At the time of writing, very heavy fighting is raging a little over a mile from the National Y. M. C. A. building. During the past twenty-four hours the booming of big cannons, the rattling of machine-guns and smaller weapons hardly ceased at all. This has been the most severe engagement since the war started a week ago.

The Chapei section of the Chinese city, where the fighting has been going on these days, is now a mass of ruins and waste. Before January 28, it was one of the most crowded and prosperous business districts. On January 29, when the fighting was gaining momentum, I watched the scene from the top of our building. Half a dozen Japanese planes were hovering around the North Railway Station where the battle was most intense. Each time a column of black smoke rose into the air, some building was hit by an incendiary bomb and caught fire. This aerial destruction soon extended itself to the business and residence district. Within a few hours, three or four big fires were started by the bombs. As the night came on, the whole northern horizon was reddened. One can see the red flares coming up through the house-tops. There is one loss in this devastating fire among all the others for which the whole cultural world must mourn with China. It is the burning of the printing plant and the editorial and administrative building of the Commercial Press,

the largest and oldest publishers in China, and the Eastern Library connected with the Press. The result of thirty-five years of laborious building up has now become a heap of ashes. The estimated loss is \$10,000,000, but no cultural loss can be computed in dollars and cents. China will remember it for generations, for it is a deep wound and an irreparable loss. Today the Press officially declared its business as closed. Three thousand workers and employees were sent away with half a month's pay.

There are now fifty thousand seeking refuge in the Settlement. Many of these have become homeless and have lost everything they had in this world except perhaps a bundle of bedding and the clothes they have on. For several days they poured into the Settlement from the fighting area. The spirit of these refugees, however, is excellent. The courageous resistance of the Chinese army has so uplifted their spirit that they are willing to give up everything for the sake of their country. Instead of bemoaning their personal losses, many of them offer themselves wholeheartedly for service to their fellow-sufferers. Over thirty refugees' camps are organised by various groups of people in Shanghai. One of the senior employees of the Commercial Press, who had both his office and his home completely destroyed by fire, is now working ferociously for the wounded soldiers. 'What do we care so long as the Japanese are repulsed?' he said to a friend who had just received news of the burning of his own house.

The intelligent people in China have no bitterness against the Japanese people as a whole. They are fully aware that it is only a small number of militarists who have fanned the flame and run away with the political machine of their country, leaving the otherwise peace-loving and innocent people to pay the price for it. There is one very outstanding feature in the present conflict. The Chinese soldiers have a sacred sense of mission in defending their country from the enemy. They are calm and unafraid of death. They have poor equipment but have an indomitable spirit. On the other hand, the Japanese, in spite of the elaborate propaganda of their Government, have no conviction of the cause for which they are sent to die. Neutral observers said they are nervous and have a tendency to retreat at the first resistance. If the Japanese Government continues in the present policy, sooner or later there will be an explosion within Japan and then a new day may dawn in which the two peoples will really understand each other.

China herself, of course, has a tremendous problem at her hands. All the important cities in Manchuria are now occupied by the Japanese; a large portion of six provinces in Central China has now



become a consolidated area under the communists; most of the 50,000,000 flood sufferers are still destitute and uncared for; the military occupation of Manchuria and the war in Shanghai have added millions to the army of unemployed, falling easy preys to the communists. All this will take years and years to remedy. At the same time, this most difficult situation constitutes a real challenge to our people. If they can rise to the occasion, the present travail will prove to be only a blessing in disguise. We have already succeeded in gathering together a good number of Christian students for service to the refugees.

Efforts for reconciliation between the Christians of the two countries are rare as well as difficult. Several weeks before the war broke out in Shanghai, we had a quiet visit from Mrs. Tomiko Wada Kohra, Professor of Japan Women's University in Tokyo. She impressed the few of us who met her as sincere and earnest and genuinely desirous of helping the situation in a Christian way. She is the author of a letter to the F.O.R. in China denouncing the Japanese Government for its militarist policy in China and sharing the blame as one of Japan's citizens.

Y. T. Wu

### Japanese Peace Poems

Better than any lengthy statements could do the following three poems, written in December 1931 by Mr. Kagawa and Mr. Takahashi, express the anxiety of Japanese Christians in the present crisis. Mr. Kagawa needs no introduction for readers of *The Student World*. Mr. Takahashi, who has been in social work for a long period, has recently decided to devote all his time to education for peace.

#### Child of an Aching Heart

Again I have become the child of an aching heart  
Carrying the burden of Japan's crime,  
Begging pardon of China and of the world  
With a shattered soul, —  
I have become a child of sadness.

*Toyohiko Kagawa*

**Why ?**

My tears fall —  
 While the people are wanting food, and starving,  
 Heartless militarists make war upon them !  
 Wandering in the hills are men and women  
 Hunting firewood and praying for peace.  
 Do the militarists know these gentle hearts ?

*Toyohiko Kagawa*

**To the Republic of China**

When your country is overwhelmed with a great flood  
 And troubled by internal dissension  
 We do not help you, but rather further the Manchurian  
 aggression !  
 Japan is militarist, surely !  
 If we do not reflect and repent,  
 We shall receive God's punishment.

Your country, now working out the problems of your  
 revolution,  
 Are we Japanese helping you ?  
 Or rather disturbing you !  
 Deeply we are ashamed.

Whatever the militarists and so-called men of intelligence say  
 Their will is not our will,  
 Their action not ours.  
 We pacifists are weak yet.  
 But we are fighting against militarism and imperialism,  
 And some day, casting them off,  
 We shall be able heartily to grasp your hands.

Let us unite, — and from the whole world,  
 Drive out all social evils, — the sweating and the parasites,  
 And achieve a peaceful world — the Kingdom of God.  
 Militarists do whatever they please,  
 And so-called men of intelligence flatter them,  
 But the land of egoism which results is not the true Japan.

I dream of the day of the Union of Asia, —  
 Flags of China, Russia, India and Japan floating high,  
 And all Asiatic nations becoming sources of blessing,  
 Supplying each others' needs,  
 Helping and loving one another.  
 Let us bring in the rejoicing of Asia !  
 Is it not our Mission ?

We hold out warm hands to your country,  
 Heartily do we long for the completion of the revolution,  
 And for the Union of Asia  
 We pacifists, feeling our powerlessness, and neglect of duty,  
 And shamed for our country's action.  
 Yet assure you of the sincerity of our hearts.

*Motoichiro Takahashi*

### The Student Christian Movement in Czechoslovakia and Disarmament

If one looks at the map, our small country seems to stretch out one hand to the East and one to the West. Students in our association, like all thinking people, try to think through what this geographical position implies. When the present Student Christian Movement was founded five years ago, it accepted a policy of œcumenic internationalism, and pacifism had a central place in its programme. Czechoslovakia is not a quiet *cul-de-sac* but a busy cross-roads, and it cannot settle down to provincialism. Hence the conditions are favourable for active peace-work. We will here give a brief report on our methods of work and future plans.

Our work for peace encounters three difficulties. The story of the rise of the Czechoslovakian Republic is a story of active, political and military opposition against the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Hence our memories of the war, especially of the past of those who took part in it, have a special intensity about them. The traditions of the "legions" and the national ideology are carefully fostered and preserved.

It is not considered permissible to bring any criticism against the army, or against its policies. Moreover, President Masaryk, the spiritual leader of many generations, even of the youngest, is at the

head of this army. That is indeed a certain guarantee, that militarism will not overstep certain limits. But on the other hand, it affords moral support to the ideology of the defensive war, which is wrongly regarded as being "pacifistic" (not only in this country, of course).

In addition to the President the Churches also officially represent this attitude, and so does the Ministry of National Defence : that the army and the whole military organisation work for the preservation of peace ; that they offer security in the country ; that they are of course against all wars for offensive purposes. This attitude is naturally exploited by the national press of military and militant circles and in the circles of army-officers. The enthusiasm of the war-veterans, the pride in our military forces, the popularity of the Sokol Movement, the fear of social reforms, and the interests of war industries, all unite to make propaganda for the so-called "defensive force" and to popularise military information and military virtues.

It was from this circle that there arose, in 1929, the first organised movement in favour of military training, on the lines worked out in Fascist Italy.

Lastly the pacifist organisations, although numerous, are weak and less influential than they deserve. For this there are several reasons : imperfect organisation, the disunity of the various movements of a theoretical, moral and religious nature, their indefiniteness, the lack of force of their leaders, and the absence of a positive programme.

In this situation our task was as follows : in 1930 we protested against military training, in 1931 we took part in arousing public opinion for disarmament, and in 1932 we are hoping to carry out intensive work for peace.

Our opposition to military training was carried out in this way : we obtained the draft proposals for military training, compared them with the previous regulations and with similar regulations in force in other countries, and distributed it among our friends. We were among those who urged the peace organisations, especially of teachers, to cooperate in a common programme. We took active part in the preliminary arrangements and deliberations of these organisations. We carried on discussions first in a small circle, later also in other groups, on the question of education for war and education for peace.

In April and May the work was carried on so intensively that the leaders of our army began to show real interest in the matter. In the autumn of 1930 we arranged a large public meeting against military training which led the Minister for Defence to warn publicly in Parliament against the activities of our Student Christian Movement.



For this meeting we had requested the Officers' Union, which works for compulsory military training, to send someone to present their side of the subject. The opposite side was taken by the writer of this report, who analysed the proposals from a political, pedagogical and religious standpoint. The discussions brought out on the one hand that the militarisation of youth was really intended, and on the other hand that the young intelligentsia was hostile to everything which might lead to war. When the proposal was finally dealt with in the committee of political parties the result was that our standpoint was accepted, at least by the social-democratic and socialist parties. The proposals had to be withdrawn.

During the course of these proceedings, which were dramatic in the extreme, it became clear that we needed more information on questions of organisation of the international order. To these problems we devoted several evenings of discussion, and resolved to give special instruction to our members in middle-schools. The visit of our friend Arnold Brémont in January 1931, and his public lectures in Prague, Brunn and Bratislava, gave us considerable encouragement.

The fundamental ideas of our new programme were as follows : an attitude of non-intervention towards the army ; no attack on the army, nor on its abuse of its power, until the Disarmament Conference. As far as possible we wish to be loyal to the State, but on the other hand we shall fight against military training , and against everything which impedes or directly interferes with the moral education of youth and of the people in favour of disarmament. We wish most emphatically to support the practical efforts for international understanding, and to trace the connection between peace and social reform (through the study of the economic and political causes of wars). We wish to work for the cooperation of pacifists, and to bring out the value of our religious point of view in the struggle for peace. We are only at the beginning of our work. We know that we are not working for one or two periods, but for our whole generation.

On three evenings we prepared ourselves by prayer and Bible-study. Then only did we begin to understand the reformation intended by our historical prophet Chelcicky. It became clear to us how one can avoid real speculation for the sake of speculation, and real activity for the sake of activity. We see Christian activity, on every hand, wrecked on the Scylla or Charybdis of one of these extremes.

In addition we made a thorough study of the subject of war in the Bible, of Heering's *Sündenfall des Christentums*, of the League of Nations, and of the history of disarmament.

In January we organised a series of public lectures, opened by Foreign Minister Benes ("The Moral Crisis and the Efforts towards Disarmament"). These lectures were attended by 2,400 students.

We were glad to have an opportunity at Plankenwarth of developing our ideas before our colleagues in the World's Student Christian Federation. In spite of difficulties we came to an understanding with our brothers, especially with the Hungarians.

We believe that the Federation is faced with a great opportunity of showing, that the Sons of Light understand the pure teaching of the Prince of Peace, on Whose Name even those sons of earth call, who otherwise do not follow Him.

J. SIMSA

### South African Student Centres

If South African universities are to be pictured through my eyes, they must be seen as surrounded in many cases by scores of the glorious flowers which make a visit from September till January such a joy to lovers of beauty, colour and form. When the University of Capetown is seen, not only with its flowered approach, but against the background of the Table Mountain, and with its wide view of the Atlantic in front, the cultural heritage of young South Africans discloses itself not only an intellectual one, but an æsthetic one.

Few contrasts could be greater than to journey thirty miles away and be in the heart of the small Cape-Dutch town of Stellenbosch, with a university scattered in many a small building hidden among the trees. It has, however, a history attaching to it that the great modern buildings on Rhodes estate outside Capetown cannot supply.

It is from this Stellenbosch University, linked with the memory of many leaders in the Dutch Reformed Church, that the Student Christian Associations of South Africa are directed. At least from there the main body of it, the "white student work" is supervised. Several hundred miles away is the centre of the native part of the Student Christian Association where Fort Hare College crowns the educational ascent for the Bantu peoples of the whole Union. At present its new buildings stand on a treeless hillside, a mile from the old settlement, so well known in the Presbyterian world, "Lovedale", the centre of a combination of educational and industrial and religious work among the many African tribes comprised under the general name 'Bantu'.

It was a scene never to be forgotten when on Sunday morning

I sat with the great Lovedale congregation in their open-air Church under the clipped oaks while hundreds of natives, boys and girls, with the white and the native staff, all joined in a solemn Communion Service. While at present Fort Hare College only has some 150 men and perhaps 10 women students, it is *the* place toward which the aspirations of the better educated natives of South Africa turn with ardent longing. There too may eventually centre the training place for social service workers, men and women, and such a training should include types of religious work such as the Y. M. C. A. and Y.W.C.A. At Fort Hare, close to the college staff houses, is the home of Max Yergan, who acts as General Administrator and indeed also travelling secretary for the Bantu student and schoolboy work.

Another glimpse at a European student centre was the sight of the splendid new university built on a commanding position just outside Durban. From its terraced front there is a view out on the Indian Ocean, across which these Indian natives came, some of them twenty years ago, to help the Englishman with his sugar plantations.— Another of the race problems of South Africa !

So far we have been following the coast from West to East, but next we must mount rapidly to Pieter Maritzburg, and the new building of its university — and go onward winding up to the plateaux which at 5,000-6,000 feet make the level of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. There too the immense advance in educational possibilities brings us into the Colleges of Bloemfontein and Pretoria and finally to the massive blocks of the Withwatersrand University of Johannesburg. — Dutch and English, Jew and Gentile alike throng the classrooms here, and prepare themselves for the leadership in science, in practical engineering, and in literary courses which is so needed in that extraordinary series of townships which has grown up around the gold mines of the Transvaal.

With such an increasing number of university-trained men and women, there seems to sound out a call for a real expansion in the Student Christian Association work — some step forward which shall make it a more vital influence compelling the attention of the more thoughtful men and women in college and attacking some of the special problems confronting Christianity in South Africa. Undoubtedly the greatest stir it has so far created has been that made by the unique gathering of white and Bantu students and leaders, held at Fort Hare College in 1930. In many countries such interracial conferences would be taken for granted, but not so in South Africa and the echoes of that valiant adventure have not yet died away, but live and awaken others.

The General Committee of the Student Christian Association is aware of the bigger horizons opening before it — but with very limited resources in money and men it is restricted. A few days in December 1931 were dedicated to the plans of the coming year, and I was delighted to be allowed as an old member of the British Student Movement staff to take a share in the planning. One great difference between the types of work belonging to the Student Movement of South Africa and of Great Britain lies in the fact that work carried on in England by the Children's Special Service Mission is in South Africa an integral part of the S.C.A. The natural corollary of this is that, as the seaside services held in summer holidays lead back to the schools all over the country from which these boys and girls come, the staff of the S.C.A. is more largely recruited from those suited to deal with the school-going age, than from those who are essentially one in spirit with the students already facing the bigger problems of thought. The S.C.A. knows this and is considering how to strengthen its actual university staff — but an outside sympathiser wonders if it can be done without making a clearer distinction between the two departments and perhaps deliberately sacrificing for a time some of the junior for the senior work.

The Dutch and English speaking problem is another of those that face the S.C.A. So far the former are certainly in the ascendency in committee and staff. Possibly they should always be so, as this corresponds with the proportion of those in school who come from Dutch and English homes. But yet, unless there is a new truly bi-lingual work done in the universities, most of the English speaking students are not likely to find all they need within the movement, nor in some colleges does the Anglican position seem to be sufficiently met.

But apart from these few problems, there is so much to encourage the heart of any one longing to see the spiritual values kept well to the fore. Christ Jesus, our Master, is being uplifted among these sections of youth in South Africa, and as ever He is drawing men and women to Himself. If there are any ways in which God shows us the possibility of further cooperation in their really overwhelming task, let us stand ready to obey.

M. SAUNDERS



## BOOK REVIEWS

## The Dialectical Theology in Oecumenical Light

Adolf Keller. DER WEG DER DIALEKTISCHEN THEOLOGIE DURCH DIE KIRCHLICHE WELT. *Chr. Kaiser-Verlag, München, 1931. Karton. R.Mk. 3.80.*

John McConnachie. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KARL BARTH. *Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1931.*

Emil Brunner. THE WORD AND THE WORLD. *Student Christian Movement Press, London 1931. 4s.*

Dialectical theology has had a curious fate. Its main exponent has a deep mistrust of publicity and popularity. He considers it his main task to revive theology properly so called and rejects violently all attempts to adapt the Christian message to the "needs" of modern man. He writes some of the most technical and difficult theological volumes which have been produced in our time. And still he does not succeed in simply being what he wants to be: just a theologian, but becomes instead the centre of a process of inter-confessional, inter-theological, and international discussion, which draws men of all sorts, of all convictions, of all nationalities into its orbit.

Professor Keller's book fortunately does not try to "explain" why this has happened. An "explanation" of spiritual events amounts to the negation of their essential significance. But he has drawn a vivid picture of the event itself. As the "Barthian" challenge has been taken up by theologians and laymen all over the world it has become almost impossible to follow its course. No one can ever pretend to keep in touch with the ocean of literature which it has brought into being. Professor Keller comes, however, as near to completeness as anyone today possibly could. And he is, therefore, able to give a most interesting "reportage" which reveals the extent to which the dialectical message has become an oecumenical phenomenon. A reportage — almost a film — in its preoccupation with actuality and its absence of definite conclusions. Some day the story will be written with more perspective. Today we can expect no more than the impression of a somewhat chaotic process of fermentation the results of which can not yet be foreseen.

On one point, however, Professor Keller comes to more definite grips with his subject, namely in his discussion of the relations between the new theology and the œcumenical movement. He makes the interesting attempt to write an apology for the œcumenical movement with the terminology and the categories of the dialectic theologians. But here again one does not get the impression of more than a preliminary skirmish. The time for the real struggle has not yet come. The œcumenical movement is a most elusive reality. In reading Professor Keller's glowing descriptions one is constantly tempted to ask : but where is *this* œcumenical movement ? So far we have only seen small and on the whole not very successful beginnings. The same must be said to the dialectical critics of œcumenism. The truth is that the world-encircling, self-confident and pretentious affair which they criticise — does not exist. If it did, there would be no such thing as a crisis in the œcumenical movement. For the moment the situation is much simpler than the opponents of both sides realise. We have the fact that the Churches, the theologies, the Christians of all nations are somehow thrown together. The international echo of the dialectical theology is a case in point. We realise that we have to find a theological justification for doing something or doing nothing in that unescapable situation. In this sense Professor Keller's emphasis on the concrete responsibility which we face in the œcumenical situation is helpful. So far, however, we have no real "œcumenical theology" or "ideology" to speak of. The "pretention" of the œcumenical movement as such exists only in the minds of a few of the more naive promoters of Unity and in the imagination of its opponents. It would be more appropriate to criticise the œcumenical movement for its lack of a well defined pretention of any kind.

Two other books come to us as signs of the international character of the conversation on dialectical theology. We can only mention them briefly in order to draw our readers' attention to them. The first is John McConnachie's *Significance of Karl Barth*. It seems to us that this is by far the clearest and most dependable introduction to Karl Barth's thought which has yet appeared in English. Mr. McConnachie has succeeded where most others have failed. He does not write as an outsider but as one who has entered into the meaning and spirit of the German originals which he interprets. And he has a fine gift for choosing the essentials and leaving out all secondary matters.

Professor Brunner's lectures given in Great Britain are as penetrating and lucid as his German writings. The only difficulty is that they

try to cover such a wide field, that they take far too much for granted. They do not, therefore, go very far as an introduction to thought and are often unnecessarily irritating, as they leave out the why and how of important affirmations. We would, therefore, express the hope that they may soon be followed by translations of his most important works.

V. 't H.

### Secular Religion

Paul Schütz. SÄKULARE RELIGION. Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen 1932.

Elsewhere in this number our readers will find a chapter from this new volume by the writer of *Zwischen Nil und Kaukasus*. If the translation has succeeded in rendering the incisive force of the original, they will find themselves challenged and... irritated by it. For Schütz is an aggressive writer who wants to shock us out of our complacent acceptance of our situation in order to make us face the eschatological realities. In his first volume the attack was indirect, hidden between the lines of his analysis of the signs of the times. In these studies he passes on to the great offensive against all of that we call today Church, religion, Christianity.

In secular *religion*, not in so-called secularism, the anti-Christian character of our age reveals itself. Nowhere does man assert himself more completely against God than in the realm of the spirit, in his "religion". Man refuses to accept the eschatological limit, that is the limit set by the existence and action of God. Man attempts in restless religious activity, to force God's Kingdom to come on earth. Whether Schütz speaks of Mammonism and Imperialism or of Schleiermacher and the younger Blumhardt (both of whom he regards as victims of this "activism"), of the Christian attitude to communism or of the oecumenical movement this is the burden of his message: faith is essentially eschatological; God cannot and will not be exploited for human ends.

Schütz passes a merciless judgment on the Church and on all "Christian" movements of our day. He shows how weak our force is, how earthen our vessels are. He finds sometimes the accents of a Kierkegaard as he denounces our clever schemes to bring the Kingdom a little nearer. And God knows that we cannot afford to overhear a voice which reminds us of our real position before a Holy God.

But a question remains. Does Schütz sufficiently realise the solidarity of mankind in its anomalous position ? If he did, he could hardly maintain his sweeping condemnations of everything that Christians today think or do. One who finds himself at every moment of his life in the typically human position of being forced to act, to choose, to take a stand, while at the same time realising that every act is a compromise, and remains in the realm of sin — writes with deeper sympathy and compassion about his fellow-Christians. Too much cocksureness in the denial that God's grace works in the world of missions, in the "organised" Church, in the œcumenical movements, is as dangerous as the proud annexation of God by promoters or "uplifters".

The "pretention" to speak and act for God is not the monopoly of the "religious activists" alone. It is the inevitable shadow of every word of witness and act of obedience — even of the writing of a challenge to Christian secularism. To say this is not to deny the necessity of radical refutation of all attempts to confuse the spirit of man with the spirit of God. But it is to ask for a touch of understanding of man's inescapable situation and of the boundless grace of a God, Who became as one of us.

V. 't H.

### The Future of Missions

JOHN R. MOTT. *The Present Day Summons to the World Mission of Christianity.* Nashville: Cokesbury Press. \$2.50, 1932, and London: Student Christian Movement Press. 7/6.

From a background of nearly forty years of accumulated experience in international Christian organisation and leadership, Dr. John R. Mott interprets in this volume of 300 pages the task of the world mission of the Protestant Church in the light of the swiftly changing currents of modern life. The author's intimate relationship to those outstanding forward movements of the Christian Church which have revolutionised missions in the last generation gives a perspective to his vision, an authority to his words and a prophetic quality to his portrayals that is unique in modern Christian leadership.

The book reflects the findings and outlook of the World Conference at Jerusalem. The material of seven of the ten chapters was delivered as the Cole Lectures at Vanderbilt University in the spring of 1931.

In the opening chapter, "World Trends", the author states it



as his conviction that just as the past twenty years have witnessed incomparably greater changes in the world than any other period of like extent, in a similar manner the world mission of Christianity has undergone an equal transformation. These profound changes constitute an irresistible summons to action to the Christian forces of both Occident and Orient. Among the significant world trends Dr. Mott lists the spirit of nationalism as manifesting greater aggression and more sense of direction than before in the history of mankind and shows how this is profoundly affecting the world mission of Christianity through the process of devolution.

In the face of such adverse facts as misunderstandings between nations, the lowered prestige of the West and the rising tide of armaments, he finds that the present international trends compare favourably with those of the past thirty-seven years. In support of this judgment is mentioned the great increase in individual and corporate efforts at promoting goodwill and cooperation.

Dr. Mott names the world-wide awakening and uprising of women as the most notable social trend of our day. To education he gives the credit of offering the impetus to this revolution, — and in Christianity he finds the only world religion which has stimulated these enlarged conceptions and opportunities. In the rapid increase of education, particularly secular and government education, Dr. Mott finds another world trend. From it he deduces the responsibility of Christian education to be qualitative rather than quantitative. Finally the gradual disintegration of the non-Christian religions as sources of vital energy and influence upon life is evidence of the lessening hold of religious forms and dogmas in the modern world. However, Dr. Mott is convinced that the Christian movement is gathering momentum from decade to decade. He sees proof of this in the quickening of the social conscience. "Quite as significant as Christ's conquest of individual lives is His ever-widening sway over whole areas of life and human relationships. "

The chapters on the Summons of Rural Life, the Summons of Industry and the Summons of Race, introduce us to three areas of missionary activity which have since the World War taken on peculiar significance. These developments call for a new approach, technique and attitude in the missionary programme.

Dr. Mott marshals the facts concerning the relation of the modern industrial trend in mission lands with a master hand. He sees in the rapid exploitation of native races by western capital, not only a denial of the world mission of the Christian Church, but a menace to the political, social and economic structure of whole peoples.

Conditions in the mines of South Africa, the factories of India, China and Japan, and the plantation of South America, present a challenge to missions never faced by previous generations. The opening of the Department of Social and Industrial Research at Geneva by the International Missionary Council, with responsibility to specialise on this aspect of the missionary task, is one answer to the problem. Another is the attention given by the National Christian Councils of mission lands to these new trends in the life of their peoples. "Only His programme and His power are adequate to meet the challenge. His Gospel is intended not only to satisfy the deepest needs and highest aspirations of the individual soul, but also to make possible the creation of the society and the ensuring of economic relations in which individual men as members of a spiritual brotherhood can live the abundant life".

In the *Summons to Race*, Dr. Mott shows that the solution of the race problem must be worked out in a world context. The implications of the Fatherhood of God for the relation of men as brothers; the unique contribution of each race to our common civilisation, and the unmistakable teachings of Jesus as to attitudes between man and man, all point to a solidarity of the human family not yet attained.

The second half of the volume deals with the most central questions of mission technique, policy, programme and message in their adjustment to the deep currents of nationalism, self-determination, disillusionment and restlessness at domination by the West that prevail in non-Christian lands. The missionary movement is portrayed as a great cooperative enterprise in which the younger and the older Churches share.

Dr. Mott considers the forming of National Christian Councils in the major mission fields with their welding of native and missionary leadership and consequent pooling of assets as a sure sign of the quickening and deepening of the Christian life, not only in the non-Christian world, but in the sending countries. To serve, to cooperate, to share is the triple watchword that is leading the forces of Christ to the conquest of the modern world.

In the last three chapters Dr. Mott deals with the *Summons of the Living Message*, the *Summons to the Home Base*, and with the *Leadership for the New Day*.

The book is a masterly and kindling portrayal of the nature and scope of the modern missionary enterprise. It is as epoch-making in the field of missionary literature as the Jerusalem Conference was in the sphere of mission gatherings, — a book worthy of taking its place beside its great predecessor — *The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions*.

J. M. D.

## Sécurité et Désarmement

André Philip, *CAHIERS BLEUS, Librairie Valois, 7, Place du Panthéon, Paris 5<sup>e</sup>. Janvier 1932. — Prix frs. 5.*

Au nombre des livres et brochures récemment parus sur la question de l'heure, citons le petit volume écrit en une langue alerte, par le jeune et brillant professeur de Lyon, dans lequel il présente d'une façon claire et vivante les problèmes essentiels que doit discuter la conférence sur la limitation et la réduction des armements. Après quelques pages très brèves sur la sécurité, M. Philip analyse le Traité de Versailles et définit les deux graves lacunes du Pacte de la Société des Nations, auxquelles depuis 1920 on s'est efforcé de porter remède : manque de précision dans la définition de l'agresseur et absence de sanctions organisées. Il faut choisir entre deux méthodes : celle de l'arbitrage obligatoire ou celle de la loi internationale. C'est cette dernière qu'il fait sienne parce qu'elle lui apparaît indispensable à « l'organisation de la paix avec, comme conséquence inévitable, l'abandon de la notion aujourd'hui dépassée de la souveraineté absolue des Etats. »

Dans le domaine des sanctions M. Philip se sépare nettement de la thèse soutenue par le gouvernement français à la Conférence du Désarmement ; l'étude des sanctions aussi bien que celle des efforts de définition de l'agresseur lui font conclure qu'aucun progrès ne peut être réalisé dans la voie de la paix, si l'on ne procède pas *au préalable* à un début de désarmement. M. Philip se meut avec aisance dans le fouillis des documents et des chiffres des armements nationaux, des tonnages, et des flottes, dont il met en lumière quelques éléments essentiels, de même en ce qui concerne le Traité de Washington visant à la limitation des armements terrestres ; il résume sobrement les débats sans issue qui ont eu lieu au sujet de « l'Article 10 du Pacte. » Il préconise une réduction de toutes les armées européennes à un modèle uniforme ; l'abolition de l'armée de métier et de la conscription universelle, remplacées par un régime de milices, utilisant seulement une partie du contingent, la stricte limitation des stocks, l'interdiction des armes offensives et le contrôle international des principales industries de paix.

On retrouve dans ce petit volume bleu, la conviction entraînante, l'attitude indépendante et les principes de celui que la jeunesse socialiste et la jeunesse chrétienne protestante de France comptent à juste titre comme un des leurs et un de leurs chefs de file ardent, généreux et compétent.

Le volume se termine par une brève étude plus rébarbative, mais clairement exposée du problème de l'or.

H-L. H.

### Evangelical Catholicism

Friedrich Heiler. IM RINGEN UM DIE KIRCHE. *Verlag Ernst Reinhardt, München*, 1931. *Brosch. R.M.* 10.80

Heiler's new book is almost an encyclopædia on Catholicism. Every Catholic movement, every Catholic standpoint, every Catholic problem is discussed in its 600 pages. And no one is better qualified to interpret these aspects of contemporary Christianity than the prophet of "Evangelical Catholicism", whose life of struggle has consistently been devoted to the realisation of this one ideal.

Heiler believes that we live in a day of rediscovery of the true meaning of Catholicity. The renaissance of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, the Anglo-Catholic revival, the High Church movement in Lutheran countries, the œcumenical movements, all these are signs of a new understanding of the true, historic meaning of the "*una sancta*". A most illuminating chapter gives a vivid picture of the corresponding movements in the Roman Catholic Church: the liturgical movement, the new interest in Bible-study and in the Augustinian tradition, the youth movement, the preoccupation with the problem of unity. These developments lead the author to look forward to the day when the truly Catholic movement will overcome the rigid Latinism and imperialism of the Roman system.

Heiler is a remarkable combination of the historian with the theologian. His book contains a wealth of information as well as a solid contribution to the fundamental philosophy of œcumenism. At the same time, however, it reveals the almost tragic character of the present œcumenical situation. There is a place in Heiler's evangelical Catholicism for every Church, for every theology which emphasises *Catholicism* rather than *evangelical*. But there is no place in it for those others who put their emphasis on the other one of the two terms. Thus Heiler fails completely to understand the real meaning of Protestantism. He becomes a prey to the common error of considering it as a mere reaction, which had its relative right in a certain historical situation. He does not see that Protestantism represents (or ought to represent) an eternal question to Catholicism, a protest not against one particular Church at one particular time, but against all particular Churches at all particular times — as it asks the simple question (directed against itself as well as against the others): whether they realise the danger of identifying their "tradition" with the word of God Himself.

Is a Catholicism which refuses to hear this challenge truly Catholic?

V. 't H.



CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, a Report of the Conference on "The Christian Approach to the Jews"; *Atlantic City, New Jersey, May 12th-15th 1931.*

This conference was under the auspices of the Council's International Committee on "The Christian Approach to the Jews". The knowledge that our long-time friend and leader, Dr. Conrad Hoffmann, left the work of the Federation to become the General Secretary of this committee, strengthens one's confidence in its possibilities for ultimately influencing the fields of better race relationships and of Christian ways of sharing with the race of Jesus the good news of His Gospel. It would be hard to name any other man in Europe or America whose contacts and achievements in international and interracial work so well equip him for the very difficult task entrusted to this committee. A fine human sensitivity as well as real statesmanship is required, because in practical work the line is very thin between proselytism, which "aims to detach the convert from his associations, traditions and concepts of religion", and that true evangelism which with no "thought of gain or prestige for any organisation" simply seeks to "share a divine life, a transforming experience of God's redemptive love in Jesus Christ."

There is so much in contemporary Christian evangelistic work with Jews that to the lay person seems so thoroughly un-Christian, that unless the work of evangelism can be put on the high level suggested by most of the addresses given at this conference, one feels that it is better to omit evangelism altogether and confine oneself wholly (as is the case with the "Goodwill Commission" of the Federation Council of the Churches of Christ in America) to discovering those areas of ethical and interreligious activity in which Christians and Jews can work together for the good of humanity.

The pages of this book, and particularly the addresses by the committee's leaders, Dr. Mott, Dr. Hoffmann and Dr. Conning, make it clear that, while the International Committee is also deeply concerned with problems of better race relationships, yet it also believes that the Christian Church can and must so share its Gospel with the Jews as to give a real basis for the hope that "some day a movement will arise within the Synagogue itself, whereby the spiritual values of the ancient faith may be retained, while giving a full and glad welcome to Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord."

The Atlantic City Conference dealt primarily with the problem in America, since the Budapest-Warsaw Conference in 1927 had centred around European problems. The fifteen addresses reported

here, and particularly the resolutions, give valuable facts and points of view on the problems involved, as well as sound principles for the guidance of the work of the Church in its work of evangelism. Whether or not one now believes in a programme of Christian evangelism for Jews, one should read this book. Many of the reviewer's prejudices against any effort beyond the building up of better race relationships were removed by the addresses and facts contained in this volume.

C. P. S.

### Eine Auseinandersetzung über den Krieg

„KIRCHE UND VÖLKERVERSÖHNUNG“; Dokumente zum Halleschen Universitätskonflikt. Mit Nachwort von D. GÜNTHER DEHN, Professor der Theologie an der Universität Halle. *Furche Verlag, Berlin N. W. 7. R.Mk. 2.—.*

An den deutschen Hochschulen ist von der „Deutschen Studentenschaft“ gegen den Professor der praktischen Theologie, D. Günther Dehn in Halle, eine Bewegung entfacht worden, die sich angeblich gegen eine Reihe von Äußerungen richtet, die dieser in einem in der vorliegenden Schrift abgedruckten Vortrag über „Kirche und Völkerversöhnung“ 1928 gemacht haben soll, die in Wirklichkeit aber Symptom einer tiefgehenden theologisch-politischen Auseinandersetzung ist. Dass bei der Berufung von Dehn nach Halle und vorher schon bei der nicht zustandegekommenen Berufung nach Heidelberg in verschiedenen Punkten von den betreffenden Stellen scheinbar in nicht ganz glücklicher Weise vorgegangen worden ist, schien ausserdem der Studentenschaft zu erlauben, aus dem geistigen Kampf gegen Dehn einen Kampf um das politische „System“ zu machen, worunter die Rechtskreise in Deutschland heute alle durch das Zusammenwirken der Mittel- und Linksparteien entstandenen Massnahmen und Einrichtungen verstehen. Von diesen sekundären, den eigentlichen Kern der Auseinandersetzungen nicht berührenden Vorgängen aber abgesehen, geht es hierum nichts Geringeres als um die Auffassung von der Stellung des Krieges in der christlichen Sittlichkeit und ihrer Auswirkungen auf Nationalbewusstsein und nationale Erziehung.

Dehn sagt in den Erläuterungen zu dem Vortrag: „Wer Gott ernst nimmt weiss, dass es kein heiliges Volkstum (obwohl es eine Gabe Gottes ist), keinen heiligen Staat, keinen heiligen Sozialismus, keine heilige Kunst gibt und ebenso keinen heiligen Krieg. Wir



drücken das ja vielleicht nicht immer so prägnant aus, aber es kann keiner Frage unterliegen, dass wir eine Neigung haben, unsere Angelegenheiten absolut zu setzen. Besonders beim Kriege, der so ungeheuerere Anforderungen an den Menschen stellt und bei dem soviel für das Volk auf dem Spiele steht, sind wir geneigt, ihm eine letzte, religiöse Akzentuierung zu verleihen. Gegen dies alles hat die Kirche zu protestieren, ja, wenn es sein muss, bis aufs Blut zu widerstehen.“ Dehn verweist damit im Einklang mit der dialektischen Theologie den Krieg, auch den Krieg aus Notwehr um das von Gott gegebene Leben, in das Gebiet der Profanität und wendet sich gegen „heidnische Religiosität, die Gott benutzt, um ihre menschlichen Angelegenheiten sich von ihm sanktionieren zu lassen.“ Er fordert damit diejenigen heraus, die den Werten der Nation, des Volkstums und des Staates letzte Akzente verleihen und in der Erhaltung und Verteidigung dieser Güter eine letzte sittliche Pflicht des Christen sehen. Er setzt sich damit in Gegensatz zu dem modernen Nationalismus, der, wo er auf seine Begründungen zurückgeht, Absolutheit verlangt. Der Nationalismus seinerseits wehrt sich gegen die von Dehn vom christlichen Bewusstsein her vorgenommene Relativierung seiner Werte, in der klaren Erkenntnis, dass es hier um Sein oder Nichtsein seiner dämonischen Macht geht, vor allem unter der jüngeren Generation.

Dass der latent schon lange vorhandene Gegensatz gerade hier, gegen den Vortrag Dehn's und seine Persönlichkeit zum Ausbruch kam, ist zufällig. Dass er nicht früher bewusst wurde und wohl heute noch nicht scharf genug erkannt wird, zeigt nur wie gross der Abstand zwischen theologischem Gespräch und öffentlicher Diskussion geworden ist. Sonst hätte man auch, wie Karl Barth in einem Artikel in der Frankfurter Zeitung, in dem er sich für Dehn einsetzt, selbst sagt, nicht Dehn angegriffen und die anderen dialektischen Theologen dasselbe ungeschoren verkünden lassen. Ein solcher Gegensatz kann eben, das zeigt sich aus den Annalen dieses Universitätskonfliktes deutlich, nicht in der politischen Arena ausgetragen werden, sondern nur dort, wo von reifen Männern um die Wahrheit der christlichen Verkündigung gerungen wird.

K. E.

## Notes on Contributors and Articles

KARL BARTH is Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn. He is of Swiss nationality and the author of *Der Römerbrief*, *Prolegomena zur Dogmatik*, *Fides quaerens intellectum* and many other works. So far only two of his books have been translated into English: *The Word of God* and *the Word of Man* and *The Christian Life*. Professor Barth's article first appeared in German in the organ of the Swiss student corporations "Zofingue".

Our American readers will notice that the word "*Americanism*" in this article is not used as a purely geographical term but rather as an expression which describes an international "religion", "made in U.S.A.", just as the other international "religions", of which Professor Barth speaks, are "made in Europe".

G. J. HEERING is Professor at the Armenian Seminary at Leyden-Holland. He is an active leader of the Christian Pacifist Movement and the author of *The Fall of Christianity* (*Der Sündenfall des Christentums*) reviewed in our Disarmament number.

PAUL SCHÜTZ is a Lutheran Pastor who has been active in relief-work for the Armenians. He is the author of *Zwischen Nil und Kaukasus* (reviewed in *The Student World*, first quarter, 1931) and editor of *Orient und Occident*. His article in this number is the translation of a chapter from his new book *Säkulare Religion*, which has just appeared at I. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen and which is reviewed in this number.

BUELL GORDON GALLAGHER was until recently Secretary of the Student Christian Movement in the United States, and is now Minister of the First Congregational Church, Passaic, New Jersey.

ERIC FENN is one of the General Secretaries of the Student Christian Movement in Great Britain and Ireland, and the author of *Things and Persons*.

TOYOHICO KAGAWA is the Japanese Christian social reformer, who by word and action exerts a world-wide influence. Translations of his works include: *The Religion of Jesus* and *Love the Law of Life*. He is the leader of the "Kingdom of God" Movement, which he describes in this number.

L. ZANDER is Secretary of the Russian Student Christian Movement outside Russia and Professor of the Orthodox Theological Faculty at Paris.



ARNOLD WERNER is Pastor of the Lutheran Church in Sweden, International Secretary of the Swedish Student Christian Movement and editor of its magazine *Var Lösen*.

JAROSLAV SIMSA is Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. in Czechoslovakia, and editor of the *Christian Review*. A Czech correspondent describes him as "by all odds the most active crusader for peace in the country".

UNA M. SAUNDERS, Vice-President of the World's Y.W.C.A., has recently visited South Africa. She was formerly a leader of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland.

---

*The Student World* has made an arrangement with the *World's Youth*, quarterly magazine of the World's Committee of Y.M.C.A.s, which makes it possible that certain articles will appear in both magazines at the same time. The editorial policy of the two magazines will, however, remain as distinct as are the fields in which they are trying to serve. *The Student World* welcomes the appearance of this new ally in a common cause.